

BRILL'S COMPANION TO
PROPERTIUS



Edited by
Hans-Christian Günther

BRILL

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

BRILL'S COMPANION TO PROPERTIUS

BRILL'S COMPANION TO PROPERTIUS

EDITED BY

HANS-CHRISTIAN GÜNTHER



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2006

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN-13: 978 90 04 13682 3

ISBN-10: 90 04 13682 7

© Copyright 2006 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill,
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

JOSEF DELZ

In Memoriam

CONTENTS

Preface	xi
---------------	----

PART ONE PROPERTIUS: THE HISTORY OF PROPERTIAN SCHOLARSHIP

1. The History of Propertian Scholarship	3
<i>Paolo Fedeli</i>	

PART TWO THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF PROPERTIUS

2. The Transmission of the Text of Propertius	25
<i>James Butrica</i>	
3. Propertian Textual Criticism and Editing	45
<i>Richard Tarrant</i>	

PART THREE PROPERTIUS AND THE TRADITION OF GREEK AND ROMAN POETRY

4. Propertius and the Origins of Latin Love-Elegy	69
<i>Francis Cairns</i>	
5. Propertius and Hellenistic Poetry	97
<i>Adrian Hollis</i>	
6. Propertius and the Neoterics	127
<i>Peter Knox</i>	

PART FOUR
THE MAJOR THEMES OF PROPERTIUS' POETRY
AND HIS POETIC TECHNIQUE

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 7. Major Themes and Motifs in Propertius' Love Poetry | 147 |
| <i>Robert Maltby</i> | |
| 8. The Image of Woman in Propertius' Poetry..... | 183 |
| <i>Elaine Fantham</i> | |
| 9. Propertius and Rhetoric | 199 |
| <i>Tobias Reinhard</i> | |

PART FIVE
AN INTERPRETATION OF PROPERTIUS' WORK

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 10. The First Book | 219 |
| <i>Gesine Manuwald</i> | |
| 11. The Second Book | 245 |
| <i>Hans Peter Syndikus</i> | |
| 12. The Third Book: Defining a Poetic Self | 319 |
| <i>Kevin Newman</i> | |
| 13. The Fourth Book | 353 |
| <i>Hans-Christian Günther</i> | |

PART SIX
THE RECEPTION OF PROPERTIUS' POETRY

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 14. The Reception of Propertius in Late Antiquity and
Neolatin and Renaissance Literature | 399 |
| <i>Simona Gavinelli</i> | |

15. The Reception of Propertius in the Modern Age: Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's <i>Römische Elegien</i> and Ezra Pound's <i>Homage to Sextus Propertius</i> Bernhard Zimmermann	417
Bibliography	429
Index	449
Index Locorum	457

PREFACE

The present volume intends to provide a comprehensive introduction to the major aspects of the work of one of the most difficult Latin poets. It was my aim to present both a fair picture of the present state of research and pieces of original scholarship; neither did I interfere with the specific form of contributions nor has there been any attempt of harmonizing eventually conflicting views. Propertius is an author who offers ample room for disagreement.

In view of the enormous difficulties of the transmitted text a considerable space is given to textual matters (Part Two), and an introduction deals with the history of Propertian scholarship (Part One), focusing on the various approaches to textual difficulties in particular. The largest space, however, is occupied by an interpretation of Propertius' four transmitted books (Part Five).

Regarding Propertius' language, I refer the reader to H. Tränkle's magisterial comprehensive study *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Wiesbaden 1960), as well as to the same author's more recent contribution 'Die Sprache des Properz und die stilistischen Tendenzen der augusteischen Dichtung' (in: G. Catanzaro – F. Santucci (eds.), *Bimillenario della morte di Propertio* (*Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi properziani*, Roma–Assisi, 21–26 maggio 1985) Assisi 1986, 155–73); however, there is also a section on language in K. Newman's contribution on Book 3 (pp. 328f.).

I am very grateful to all contributors for their collaboration and hope that this book will be useful to scholars and students alike. Special thanks for advice in the planning phase of the volume go to Arnd Kerkhecker and Gesine Manuwald. For technical help with the preparation of the volume I thank Maia Danelia and Eka Gamkrelidze. During the final stage of revision of the volume Josef Delz died in June of this year. We all hope that the dedication of this volume will be found worthy of the memory of a man whose scholarly and human merits are too well known to need further mention.

Freiburg, November 2005

H.-C. Günther

PART ONE

PROPERTIUS: THE HISTORY OF PROPERTIAN
SCHOLARSHIP

CHAPTER ONE

THE HISTORY OF PROPERTIAN SCHOLARSHIP

Paolo Fedeli

In the preface to his 1816 *Propertius*, the young Lachmann first established the criteria on which his edition was based, and then felt it necessary to distinguish the tasks of a *criticus* from those of an *interpres*. He claimed to be only a *criticus*, as his still tender age would not allow him to take on the mantle of the *interpres*. This apparently very modest affirmation cannot hide Lachmann's proud conviction that the *criticus* is superior to the *interpres*; however, a true *criticus* must necessarily be an *interpres*. In any case, in the very same 1816 edition, Lachmann did not limit himself to acting as a *criticus*, but also carried out the role of the *interpres*.¹

Propertian studies have of course never been completely able to dissociate the two: when faced with a late and in many ways suspect tradition, in the presence of a text that—despite a few recent and rather unconvincing attempts to seek a way out by recourse to *emendatio*—had a number of highly original features compared with the usual schemas of the Augustans, from one point of view the activity of *recensio* cannot be reduced to pure mechanics, but implies a continuous reflection on the right way of understanding the Propertian text, while from another the task of anyone who wishes to understand, explain and comment can never be entirely separated from a full awareness of the limits of Propertian manuscript tradition.

Before Lachmann turned his attention to it, the Propertian text had never been treated any differently from other Latin authors, for whom a vulgate tradition had become consolidated, dating back to the early humanistic editions. Regarding the *editio princeps* of Propertius, there were two published in Venice in 1472, the first probably being the apparently anonymous one (though it was actually printed by

¹ Lachmann (1816) IV.

Federico de' Conti)² dated February, which is based on widely interpolated manuscripts of the Δ family, and on a manuscript in Venice's Biblioteca Marciana (Z = Bibl.Marc., Fondo antico 443 [1912]), which descends *recta via* from the Petrarchan manuscript.³ The text of the other 1472 Venetian edition, printed by Vindelino da Spira, is based on the Laurentianus plut. 36,49 (F), which was owned by Coluccio Salutati and continues to occupy a place of honor in Propertius' critical apparatus, and on a Göttingen manuscript of little value. If, as I personally continue to believe, it is correct to divide Propertian tradition into two families (N on one side, the second family on the other), this means that the Propertian vulgate has been built upon the text of the second family.

It was with Domizio Calderini (1447–1478) that the Propertian work first attracted the attention of the Humanists and became the privileged subject of a series of commentaries, which should be regarded as being the archetypes of the modern ones. Calderini⁴ pioneered Propertian studies right from the first edition of his notes on the more obscure passages, included in his commentary on Statius' *Silvae* and on the *epistula Sapphica* attributed to Ovid.⁵ The features of humanistic commentary are clearly delineated, and were intended to act as a rudimentary critical apparatus, aimed to exalt the *fulmen ingenii* when faced with the provisional nature of the manuscript tradition: in Calderini's case there are a dozen or so conjectures, only one of which appears to be reliable.⁶ The humanistic commentaries, however, were mainly very poor of problems connected with literary genres and cultural influences, and ignored any allusiveness, and were not confined to comments on the author in question. Rather, they aim to create a repertory of data that may be of use to other authors. It is clear that as far as Propertius is concerned, Calderini's classical sources were different from the mainly Hellenistic ones that the Latin author could rely on: so the humanistic commentator attempted to show off his erudition, especially in the privileged field

² Buonocore (1996) 195; for more details on the Federico de' Conti and Vindelino da Spira editions, now cf. Rose (2001) 157–160.

³ Butrica (1984) 159.

⁴ Cf. Coppini (1996) 27–79 and Rose (2001) 381.

⁵ Cf. Calderini (1475).

⁶ This refers to *discusseris*, which at 4.1.141 corrects the erroneous *discusserit* of the manuscripts.

of mythology, where he was helped by his knowledge of Strabo, Pausanias, Pliny the Elder, and Diodorus Siculus.

The limits of Calderini's *elucubrationes* did not escape the attentions of Filippo Beroaldus (1453–1505), whose 1487 commentary⁷ severely criticizes his conceptual obscurity, in agreement with other equally critical humanists such as Merula and Politian.⁸ Beroaldus, however, is proudly aware of the merits of the commentator, who, when dealing with a poetic text, 'involucra explicat, obscura illustrat, arcana revelat':⁹ it almost seems as if the dignity of the commentator—put in such terms—attains divine status. There can be little doubt that even though Beroaldus created his text thanks to the contamination of the 1472 *editio princeps* and Volscus' 1482 edition, he was more prone than Calderini to resort to the manuscript tradition, even though he was under no illusions as to its true value. Favoring emendation over interpretation, he assiduously carried out emendations on the basis of conjecture, shying away as a rule from comparison with other ancient authors, but adopting a vaguely palaeographic criterion, so that sometimes he recognized a mistake through an exchange of letters or, in the conjecture he had proposed, he tried to use the same number of letters as in the vulgate. The criteria that underlie the textual choices were identified one by one in the *elegantia* or in the *venustas* of one reading as compared with others, or else in its *latinitas* or even in its *simplicitas*. Yet, despite his malevolent attacks on Calderini, he takes plenty of material from him, without even citing the origins: the commentary began to establish common ground, using the contributions of all his predecessors, but it is far from clear whether he used them in any novel way. The merits of Beroaldus, which at the same time constitute a fundamental broadening of the horizons of commentaries, lie in the care he took over defining the *poeticus sensus*, the *poetica elegantia*, and the *poetica lectio*, which he achieves in his attempt to reconstruct stylistic devices both through dedicating particular attention to the author's lexicon and by highlighting the rhetorical figures he used. In this sense, his commentary marked a great improvement, even though in an attempt

⁷ Cf. Beroaldus (1486–1487).

⁸ As Beroaldus writes in the preface, 'extant Domitii enarrationes luculenter quidem scriptae sed adeo concisae ut sibi soli et musis sicuti dici solet cecinisse videatur'.

⁹ Both this and the previous citation are taken from Beroaldo's epistola dedicated to his friend and townsman, Mino de Rossi.

to avoid Calderini's over succinctness, Beroaldus often risks falling into the opposite trap of over prolixity: there are dozens of paraphrases and digressions, the text is dominated by a historical/mythological approach, and there is no lack of conceptual repetitions.¹⁰

Five years before the Beroaldan commentary came Volscus' edition,¹¹ but a year later came his commentary,¹² for which both Calderini and Beroaldus (even though they are not cited by Volscus) provided plenty of material. Calderini had also tended to give greater value to his own conjectures over the authority of the manuscript tradition, which is deliberately underplayed, whereas Beroaldus had often backed up his emendations with references to *vetusti codices*. However, all of the merits of this commentary lie in its organization, as in contrast to Beroaldus's inclination to garrulousness, Volscus achieved a balance in his interpretation.¹³

A pupil of Turnebus' (1512–1565), who dealt with the Propertius text in his *Adversariorum libri XXX*, and son of Iulius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558), Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) deserves a prominent place in the annals of Propertian scholarship, as he influenced the field greatly by considering the relationship with the manuscript tradition in a highly innovative way. Indeed, his contribution to the Propertian text is valuable not only for its numerous conjectures, which often definitively clear up obvious errors in the manuscript tradition, but also for the way in which he closely scrutinized the poetical structure and the internal logical connections: this led him to prefer using transpositions rather than underlining lacunae whenever the context appeared to present logical gaps. His edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, accompanied by a comprehensive series of *castigationes*,¹⁴ was written—if we are to take his prefatory letter to Claudio Puteano at face value—in the incredibly short space of twenty days while convalescing from a serious illness.

Wilamowitz, who painted a lively and fascinating portrait of Scaliger in his *Geschichte der Philologie*, expresses a singular assessment of him:

¹⁰ On Beroaldo's commentary, as well as Rose's monumental volume (2001) 277–361, cf. also Bise Casella (1996) 135–51.

¹¹ Volscus (1482).

¹² Volscus (1488).

¹³ On Volscus' commentary cf. Lupattelli (1996) 381–393 and Rose (2001) 393–99.

¹⁴ Scaliger (1577). In 1593 Scaliger was called to Leiden, to the university that after the Reformation had been abandoned by Justus Lipsius, who had reconverted to Catholicism and moved to the Catholic stronghold of Louvain.

whereas his text editions were not of great importance, he is worthy of being used as a model because he showed philologists the aim of all their tasks.¹⁵ Scaliger had one great advantage over many of his contemporaries, which was his enviable knowledge of the Greek language and of Greek authors: this was to suggest to him a number of definitive corrections to the Propertian text.¹⁶ He frequently attacks Beroaldus, who in his view was responsible for most of the distortions that spoiled the Propertian text, as well as for clearly erroneous deletions and emendations. He aims his lively criticism mainly at conservative critics, who defend corrupt texts without questioning themselves about the nature of the corruption and its origins. And he proposes the need to use the manuscripts critically as an antidote to their way of operating. However, despite his best intentions, in practice his need to find ancient manuscripts to use in his editions led to the identification of a manuscript, which with no justification whatsoever he regarded as the prime example of the tradition, having recourse to *divinatio* whenever the text proved to be clearly wrong. It is noteworthy, however, that he raised the issue of reconstructing a medieval archetype. Convinced that the Propertian manuscripts he knew of had a common origin, he briefly traced the history of the text back to the archetype, trying to identify the origin of the many corruptions and transpositions. In his view, the archetypal Italic codex of Propertius ‘avorum nostrum memoria in cella vinaria inventus fuit’, and from that *exemplar* were derived ‘omnia illa, quotquot hodie in Italia habentur’. The limitations of Scaliger’s *recensio* are clear when we consider what he regarded as the *codex optimus*: in fact the *Cuiacianus*,¹⁷ which he referred to constantly and which he used as the basis for his edition, in the conviction that it provided excellent readings, has since proven to be a late manuscript of no value.

But there is more to Scaliger’s innovations: later, on p. 4 of the *Castigationes*, he attempted to reconstruct the script of the archetype of the Catullian manuscripts based on the corruptions committed by

¹⁵ Wilamowitz (1927) 22–24.

¹⁶ I am thinking, for example, of *Teuthrantis* in 1.11.11; *ab Oetaeis* in 1.13.24; *Iolciacis* in 2.1.54; of *et Thebae* in 2.28.54; *Nai, caduca* in 2.32.40; *Phaeacas* in 3.2.13.

¹⁷ It is the Egerton 3027 codex, from the British Library, written in 1467 by Pacificus Maximus Irenaeus of Ascoli: as well as Palmer-Ellis (1876) 124–158, cf. Butrica (1984) 246–47. In Housman’s opinion, Cuiacianus is ‘perhaps the worst manuscript of Propertius in the world’.

the apographs, and the same principle of a palaeographic explanation for a corruption is applied to a series of Propertian passages.¹⁸

Convinced of the need to use conjectures in order to improve a text that had been badly spoiled by manuscript corruptions, he carried out a number of often splendid and significant interventions.¹⁹ The main innovation was the use of transpositional criticism, an approach that has, however, been heavily criticized, both at the time and since, beginning with Lachmann. Even though in his eyes Scaliger was a genius, Lachmann accused him of completely missing the point in his attempts at transposition, to which Lachmann was violently opposed—so much so that he underlined it in his program set out in the preface.²⁰ His pupil Moriz Haupt took every opportunity to repeat his master's views, and in a piece written in 1857 he attacked the transpositional method Scaliger had used for the text of Tibullus.²¹ But even a critic such as Emil Baehrens, who was anything but conservative, took issue with Scaliger, who he regarded as guilty of greatly damaging scholarly knowledge of the genuine Propertian text and undermining the credibility of a method that in itself was perfectly legitimate.²² Among modern critics, the opinions of Timpanaro and Kenney stand out—the first more balanced,²³ the second scathing.²⁴

¹⁸ For example, in 1.5.8 when he refuses *non solet* he observes: 'scriptura enim vetus habet, *non sciet*. Quod explicatione non indiget: facilis lapsus fuit, ut *c* in *o* et *i* in *l* mutaretur'.

¹⁹ As well as those cited above in note 16, here is a (certainly partial) list: 1.11.5 *ah ducere*; 2.10.22 *his*; 2.18.10 *abiunctos*; 2.20.8 *depluit*; 2.25.2 *excludi*; 3.3.33 *iura*; 3.3.42 *flare*; 3.8.11 *rabida*; 3.13.35 *hinulei*; 3.18.2 *fumida*; 3.21.8 *amicta*; 4.6.3 *serta*... *certent*; 4.6.72 *blanditaeque*; 4.9.34 *fana*.

²⁰ Lachmann (1816) XVIII: 'scilicet Josephum Scaligerum, qui primus de sensus cohaerentia in hoc poeta accuratius quaesivit, cum in multis sententiarum ordinem non recte procedere sentiret, nulla librorum scriptorum reverentia, omnia audaci conatu, eventu infeliciore, ita, ut libebat ipsi, pervertisse ac transposuisse satis constat'. There are also criticisms of Scaliger p. 114 for 2.3.45–54, p. 165 for 2.18, p. 206 for 2.30, pp. 251–52 for 3.7.

²¹ Haupt (1876) 30–41. For the transpositions in Propertius cf. pp. 34–36; on p. 36 Haupt states with a satisfied air, that 'die verfehlten Umstellungen Scaligers im Tibullus und Propertius sind seit Volpi begraben'.

²² Baehrens (1880) XV.

²³ Timpanaro (1981) 10–11: in his opinion 'dall'ipotesi, in sé perfettamente legittima, di un archetipo assai mal ridotto egli si sentì fin troppo autorizzato a trasporre brani di poesie, specialmente di Tibullo, per dar loro un ordine logico'.

²⁴ According to Kenney (1973) 55–56, the Scaliger edition 'has achieved something of a bad eminence in the history of Propertian scholarship, where it initiated a fashion, still by no means defunct, of eliminating supposed incoherence or inconsequence of thought or expression by more or less wholesale transposition of cou-

We may of course agree that Scaliger went too far, even though we have to recognize that his transpositional criticism has in the meantime seen an energetic revival—first with Richmond and more recently with Goold, Butrica, and Günther. In any case, condemning transposition apodictically means falling into the opposite fault, because it fails to take into account that he had identified a solid base and a valid justification for his methodological decisions in the chaotic and highly fragmentary situation of Book 2 (but he was probably wrong to involve Book 3 in the decision. In that sense, his conclusions anticipate those later reached by Lachmann on the insecure status of Book 2. It is no coincidence that the transpositions become far more common in Book 2. It could be said that the result is often disappointing and that often we are faced with a highly doubtful Propertian text; however, we must admit that Scaliger was the first to identify, with great clarity, the existence of the problem (the disorder in Propertius Book 2, considered within the context of the general unreliability of its manuscript tradition), and that he tried to counter this by using a remedy that is theoretically both valid and practicable.²⁵

From 1593 on, Scaliger spent the latter years of his life at Utrecht University. It is no coincidence that after his death, it was Dutch philologists who were to make the greatest contributions to pre-Lachmannian Propertian scholarship. It should be noted that Scaliger's influence was so evident and led to a series of textual choices, that over two centuries after his edition, Laurens van Santen (Santenius 1746–1798), in his preface to Burman's posthumous edition (1780), pointed out this influence, reproaching the deceased publisher for having followed Scaliger's lead in such a servile manner: however, in his defense, he did admit that Burman had repented, but that

plets or groups of couplets (...). He refers to a copy of Propertius from which all the surviving Italian MSS must derive; but his argument of course entailed that *all* the MSS must descend from a common source, a copy gratuitously mangled by some outrageous sciolist, an 'audax aut negligens homo', who confused whole pages and passages of the second and third books of elegies'.

²⁵ The widespread anathema is in sharp contrast to the praise showered on him by Günther (1997ba) 1–2 n. 1, who agrees with his method; in his opinion 'on closer inspection Scaliger's transpositions always show a remarkable perceptiveness for the problems of the text and often present the best result that can be achieved by transposition alone without assuming lacunae'. Grafton (1983) 176ff. expressed a balanced opinion; for more on Scaliger's Propertius, see also Restani (1996) 177–88.

this had come too late to make any changes.²⁶ Special mention must go to Janus Dousa Pater (1545–1604) and Janus Dousa Filius (1571–1597),²⁷ Johann Georg Graeve (1632–1703), a German who lived in Utrecht,²⁸ and Jan van Broekhuizen (1649–1707).²⁹ All of these, however, are overshadowed by the personality and work of Niklaas Heinsius (1620–1681), whose principal merit was to have carried out an intense search for manuscripts in his frequent travels all over Europe, during a period of intense diplomatic activity. He had the good fortune to come across N first, which he collated in a rather imprecise and hurried fashion,³⁰ though he was unable to recognise its importance. In his *Adversariorum libri*³¹ he gathered together a whole series of conjectures on the Propertian text, which show a wide knowledge of elegiac language (in particular Ovid) and an ability to propose interventions of great importance. Even though he had inherited Scaliger's concept of the medieval archetype,³² his method was not always rigorous: in fact Heinsius favored keeping to the text that had been transmitted where the codices agreed, and intervened whenever they disagreed without worrying too much about their relative importance in terms of the *recensio*. We often get the impression that he corrected the text in order to show off his elegant style and to embellish the text; many times, despite all this, he made the right decision. So, in the final analysis, we can agree with Wilamowitz, when—after maintaining that Heinsius emended *et codicum et ingenii ope*, thus providing a model which was used by many who shared neither his sense of style nor his *ingenium*—he concluded

²⁶ Santen *ap.* Burman (1780) XIV: 'transpositiones versuum et elegiarum a Scaligero factas, adoptavit omnes, illisque acquiescendum putavit, quia secundum hunc ordinem nunc plerumque adferuntur loca Propertii, confusionis vitandae causa. Harum licet nonnulla vehementer probaret, et ipsum Scaligerum semper veneraretur, in progressu tamen operis se huius instituti adeo poenitere, saepe mihi confessus est, ut, si res esset integra, mutaturus esset consilium'.

²⁷ Dousa pat.—Dousa fil. (1581) and then Dousa fil. (1592).

²⁸ Graevius (1680).

²⁹ Broukhusius (1702). Among the manuscripts he used, only Daventriensis I.82 (D) was of any importance, quite undeservedly so, as today it has been totally rejected as interpolated. Not even Broukhusius escaped the wrath of Lachmann, who accused him of misreading previous commentaries and of being a poor emendator.

³⁰ Lachmann (1816) X noticed this, accusing him of collating N 'satis negligenter et cum festinatione'.

³¹ Heinsius (1742); the Notae in Sex. Aur. Propertium are on pp. 654–762.

³² On this topic, see Timpanaro (1981) 11.

that 'der Widerwille gegen das nichtige Konjizieren darf unsere Bewunderung für Heinsius' Genialität nicht stören'.³³

The greatest contribution that eighteenth-century Dutch philology made to Propertian scholarship lies in the edition by Pieter Burman Secundus (1713–1778), which although unreliable at a *recensio* level is notable for the breadth and usefulness of its commentary. Nephew of his namesake, the far more famous philologist, pupil of Graevius, and friend of Bentley (1668–1741), Burman dedicated the latter part of his life to Propertian commentary, but he was destined never to see it published. The work, at least half of which had already been printed, was completed in 1780 and published as Burman had wished by Laurens van Santen in Utrecht.³⁴ This was the *summa* of the scholar's critical activity, making great use of the *Notae in Propertium* by Nikolaas Heinsius, which he himself had published in 1742. The ten manuscripts Burman used, to which we can add Heinsius' collation of N, can all be identified, thanks to Butrica's invaluable repertory. Apart from the most ancient and authoritative representative of the second family (A, Voss.Lat. O.38), which, however, ends at 2.1.63, the only one that had been regarded as being of any importance until recent times was D (Daventriensis I.82), an inferior manuscript that should now be banished from the Propertian critical apparatus. It is easy to see that the manuscripts at Burman's disposal were unlikely to provide him with a reliable text: for the most part Burman's collations are far from impeccable, as first pointed out by Lachmann. The result was of course disappointing, and the many superfluous or clearly mistaken conjectures are the logical consequence of a text constructed without any precise idea of the relationships and hierarchies among the manuscripts.³⁵ Its strength lies in its thorough commentary, which is a *summa* of the previous ones. In this field, Burman's work was both valuable and scrupulous, and we can safely state that very few previous contributions escaped his careful attention. For this reason, his commentary is a mine of informations, which later commentators exploited to the full.³⁶

³³ Wilamowitz (1927) 33.

³⁴ Burman (1780).

³⁵ I have provided a sample of the interpretation and collation errors in Fedeli (1999) 244–47. There I also discuss Burman's conjectures which clear up errors in the text.

³⁶ Just by looking at his indices we can get an idea of the sheer breadth of Burman's literary knowledge.

When his Propertian edition was published in 1816,³⁷ Karl Lachmann was just 23 years old. As we have seen, before Lachmann turned his attention to it, the Propertian text had never been treated any differently from other classical authors, for whom a vulgate tradition had become consolidated, dating back to the humanistic *editiones principes*. Inevitably, these editions had ended up imposing a text that had been widely modified by copyists of worthless manuscripts, who had carried out a systematic series of interventions to embellish the text or make it easier to understand. The origin of the so-called ‘Lachmann method’, in which the constitution of a text is the result of *recensio* of the manuscripts, which enables the scholar to get back to the archetype, and of *emendatio* whenever the text is unacceptable, can be seen clearly in the juvenile edition of Propertius, especially in the Preface. There Lachmann enunciates the six criteria on which he founded his edition: (1) constant indication of his divergences from Burman; (2) mention of the readings of the best manuscripts, even if these have been rejected; (3) discussion of the variants according to the authoritativeness of the representatives of the manuscript tradition; (4) analysis of only the most significant passages; (5) scrupulous establishment of the paternity of the conjectures; (6) work close to that of the commentator in defining the consistency between the phrases and the links between the various contexts (this pertains to Lachmann’s decidedly negative opinion on the many transposition proposals made by Scaliger).

Lachmann’s lack of faith in the editors who preceded him is absolute: so he feels it is necessary to start again from scratch, totally ignoring the vulgate and without wasting too much time over collating the *vetusta exempla*. His guidelines on the constitution of the text are a defense of the readings handed down to us from the employed manuscripts and the *emendatio ope codicum*: the former is carried out with the aid of mainly poetic and Augustan examples, while the latter occurs, as Lachmann himself admits, in only two cases.³⁸ Lachmann’s choice appears to be the right one: first of all, he says, we must consider ‘quid codices ferant’; but, he adds, if the

³⁷ Lachmann (1816).

³⁸ This happened for 4.1.73 and for the controversial points in 1.21. On this matter, see Fedeli (1996) 360–61; there I also discuss a few cases in which Lachmann tries to explain the origins of the corruptions on using paleographic criteria.

readings of the manuscripts are unsatisfactory, 'ratione igitur potius quam codicum auctoritate res agenda videtur'.³⁹ The latter possibility occurs often, if we consider the large number of Lachmannian conjectures for Propertius (around two hundred), nearly all of which were accepted in the text. What is more, Lachmann is induced to make conjectures due to divergences between the manuscripts in only around sixty cases, whereas in all other cases he uses conjecture because he regards the text handed down to him as being corrupt, even though it apparently makes sense.

Lachmann rightly understood the value of N, but that led him to distance himself from the rest of the manuscript tradition and to regard as *deterrimi* the codices used by previous editors. In any case he knew full well that he could not base his *recensio* on a single codex, and his solution was to classify manuscripts as either *genuini* (the ones he used) or *interpolati*. In effect, despite his best intentions, among the *genuini*, apart from the Neapolitanus, he only used the Groninganus.⁴⁰ So even in his case the choice of manuscripts to base his *recensio* on was not the result of a sufficiently careful examination to justify why he eliminated some or preferred others; in this field subjectivity continued to rule when identifying *codices genuini*, nor does Lachmann provide any justifications for his choice. A far more serious fault lies in the fact that even though he recognized that Neapolitanus was much older than Groninganus, he still considered it to be inferior. So in the end his edition was based essentially on a late fifteenth century manuscript, which has since been banished from the critical apparatus for being interpolated. So Lachmann failed in his main aim, which was to distinguish 'qui codices veterem ac sinceram scripturam tenerent, qui a doctis Italis interpolati essent'⁴¹ and his edition ended up being "an 'optimist' text based essentially upon the Groninganus alone".⁴²

There can be no doubt, however, that despite all its limitations the text proposed by Lachmann in the 1816 edition marks a radical improvement over the vulgate (which had continually been proposed by previous editors) and so should be regarded as the first

³⁹ Lachmann (1816) 109.

⁴⁰ This is the manuscript at the Universiteitsbibliotheek in Groningen, B.P.L. 133 A; see Butrica (1984) 240–41.

⁴¹ Lachmann (1816) VII.

⁴² Butrica (1984) 3–4.

true modern Propertian text. Lachmann should be recognized for the fundamental achievement of giving correct weight to Scaliger's statements on the problematic status of Book 2 and for having been the first to propose a subdivision into two books. The original Book 3, in Lachmann's view, would start at 2.10. Lachmann's excellent intuition—recently taken up again by Propertian scholars—is based on 2.13.25–26, in which Propertius dictates his funeral arrangements to Cynthia, claiming that he would be happy for his funeral cortege to be made up of the *three* books of poetry he would like to take as an offering to Persephone: 'absurde tamen egit poeta—observes Lachmann—si hoc carmen, in quo trium librorum mentio incitur, nulla quidem necessitate cogente, secundo inseruit'.⁴³ As regards the original Book 2, which, in Lachmann's view, runs from elegies 1 to 9, he maintains that its *pars prior* 'tota lacera ad nos pervenit'.⁴⁴

The *editio minor*, published in Berlin in 1829, is based on the 1816 text, with the addition of a few conjectures. There is no preface at all, but this is compensated for by a systematic recording in the critical apparatus of the Groninganus and Neapolitanus variants, as well as the emendations by Franciscus Puccius⁴⁵ and the lections of the 1481 Reggio Emilia edition. The other codices that he had regarded as *genuini* in 1816 had sunk without trace.

Wilhelm Adolf Boguslaw Hertzberg (1813–1879) was by no means a distinguished philologist, as is clear from his commented edition of 1845.⁴⁶ He took the same position as Lachmann, praising the Groninganus and adding only a few manuscripts of lesser worth; he did not even have the good fortune to read the 1843 *Observationes criticae in Propertium*, in which H. Keil reevaluated the Neapolitanus, claiming that it was due at least the same dignity as Groninganus. Despite this, Hertzberg deserves a place among those who have contributed to the advancement of Propertian scholarship—first of all for his commentary, which no longer looks like the traditional *cum notis variorum* ones, nor does it confine itself to discussing controversial points from critical texts, as Lachmann had. His commentary is the first to include substantial linguistic observations and to search for the sources of Propertian poetry. Also, the text is accompanied

⁴³ Lachmann (1816) XXII.

⁴⁴ Lachmann (1816) XXI.

⁴⁵ See Smyth (1970) 174.

⁴⁶ Hertzberg (1843–45).

by a critical apparatus of unusual breadth. But probably the most striking thing comes in volume I of *Quaestiones Propertianae*, the first attempt to carry out a global interpretation of Propertius' character and poetry—and in that sense he anticipates modern monographs.

When discussing *de perturbato secundi libri statu* in his *Quaestiones Propertianae*, Hertzberg went much further than Lachmann in citing the reasons for not dividing the Propertian *corpus* into four books, even though he remained faithful to such a division. The reaction to Lachmann—both regarding this important structural problem and when identifying the manuscripts needed for the *recensio*—came in 1880, a year that saw editions by E. Baehrens⁴⁷ and A. Palmer,⁴⁸ both of whom returned to the traditional subdivision. Baehrens' is the first true modern critical edition of Propertius, especially in its 'solidus apparatus criticus' which he claimed to have introduced,⁴⁹ despite the debatable nature of many of his choices, his overindulgence in conjecture, and especially the wrong dates given for the manuscripts⁵⁰ and his incorrect evaluation of their importance. Baehrens should be congratulated, though, for finally freeing the Propertian apparatus from the embarrassing presence of Groninganus and for systematically introducing A (already known to Burman) and F, even though he did not notice the link between the two manuscripts; however, he also claimed that D and V were both fundamental manuscripts, whereas Butrica finally demonstrated that these are worthless. So, once N had been banished, Baehrens's text ended up by being based—as in the pre-Lachmannian editions—only on representatives of the second family.⁵¹

But the end of the nineteenth century saw the arrival on the Propertian scene of A. E. Housman. Even though it is not possible to agree with all of his textual choices, it must be said that his Propertian contributions, all of which were republished in his Classical Papers, bear witness to his outstanding philological talent and his consistent methodology, which rejects supine acquiescence toward the text that has been handed down to us. The mistake Housman

⁴⁷ Baehrens (1880).

⁴⁸ Palmer (1880).

⁴⁹ Baehrens (1880) XL.

⁵⁰ As an example, Baehrens did his utmost (p. VIII) to demonstrate that Neapolitanus was a product of the fifteenth century!

⁵¹ Leo (1880) 441–43 promptly reacted against this devaluation of N; see also Housman (1893) 105.

made, however, came at the very start—i.e., in his choice of manuscripts and in the importance he attached to them. In his works on the Propertian manuscript tradition, Housman never made any effort to reconstruct the history of the text through the history of the manuscripts, but considered the manuscripts as mere containers for variants. Based essentially on those used by Baehrens and accepting his mistaken dates, he distinguished three families (A F; D V; the correcting hands of F V) and felt that N was a manuscript of no value, a descendant of lost representatives from the three families. As an obvious consequence of this, many of Housman's conjectures are undermined by this error of judgment. However, it is astonishing how often he manages to reconstruct an undoubtedly genuine reading, despite his error of judgment over the manuscript tradition. His solid sense of language and style, coupled with an exceptional sensitivity for identifying corruptions, and an ability to come up with brilliant solutions mean that Housman is for Propertius what Bentley was for Horace.

The end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth were marked by a row over Max Rothstein's commentary.⁵² More than fifty years after the previous Propertian commentary (by Hertzberg) Rothstein's originality was clear, but his efforts met with the implacable hostility of Friedrich Leo's review.⁵³ There can be no doubt that Leo was right to highlight the unreliability of Rothstein's textual choices, caused by his blind faith in N, which led him to accept even the most obviously mistaken readings, as well as frequent cases of obscure expression, the imperfect and defective identification of Propertius' sources, and his insensitivity toward the poetic text: 'auch ein Dichtercommentar—cautioned Leo—hat seinen Stil; in ihm soll sich nicht nur das Denken, auch das Empfinden des Interpreten spiegeln'.⁵⁴ Notwithstanding, this was an important moment in the history of Propertian scholarship, because Rothstein was the first to attempt an overall well-thought-out exegesis and the first truly modern Propertian commentary, a radical change from the *cum*

⁵² Rothstein (1898).

⁵³ See Leo (1898) 722–50. Leo's criticisms drew a response from Rothstein (1900) 441–65, which was itself followed by another reply by Leo (1900) 604–11. Rothstein was later to take Leo's words into account, albeit rather partially, when over two decades later, in 1920, he published the second edition of his commentary.

⁵⁴ Leo (1898) 739.

notis variorum ones that had marked the previous four hundred years: despite its limitations, this commentary never fails to carry—out a serious linguistic analysis and is highly sensitive towards intertextual relationships. Rothstein's commentary thus remains the archetype for a number of twentieth century commentaries, which have no longer allowed text criticism to become separated from exegetic reflection, nor reconstruction of models from literary and linguistic analysis.

The twentieth century was a time of great developments in Propertian scholarship, with the text becoming a battleground for many different critical movements. Most of the numerous critical editions were conservative—albeit to different extents and excluding the ones by Richmond (1928) and Goold (1990). They were essentially based on N and filled with a plethoric apparatus due to the redundant presence of members of the Δ family. It was not until Butrica (1984) that their worthlessness for the purposes of reconstructing the text was clearly demonstrated. But second thoughts are always a possibility: *expertus dico*, because commenting on Book 2, I changed my mind on more than 150 occasions compared with my 1984 edition. Perhaps it is worth reflecting on what Leo said about Rothstein's conservative reaction: 'die Kühnheit dieser Reaction ist nicht minder radical als die der Conjecturenmacher. Der unsicheren Conjectur im Text ist gewiss die unerträgliche Überlieferung vorzuziehen, wenn sie als solche bezeichnet ist; aber der Corruptel im Text mit Entschuldigung im Commentar ist die erträgliche Conjectur vorzuziehen. Kritik ist weder conservativ noch liberal, sondern sie sondert das Falsche vom Richtigen'.⁵⁵

At the other extreme, conjectural criticism—preferred by the post-Baehrens Dutch school—started off the twentieth century with a failure under Louis Havet: it is astounding that this critic of genius, author of *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris 1911) was so out of touch with Propertius.⁵⁶ In this field the best work was done by Shackleton Bailey⁵⁷ (not so much for the conjectures he came up with as for the remarks on the text that has been handed down), and especially by a rich vein of contributions to the Propertian

⁵⁵ Leo (1898) 735.

⁵⁶ Havet (1916).

⁵⁷ See Shackleton Bailey (1945) 119–22; (1947) 89–92; (1949) 22–29; (1956) *passim*.

text by Goold,⁵⁸ a scholar in the best Housmanian traditions. Interpolationist criticism, which from the 1930s onward was the province of Günther Jachmann and, later, Ulrich Knoche,⁵⁹ has found new life in recent years, as scholarship on the history of the text have increased awareness of the fact that the *corpus* of Propertian elegies underwent a series of systematic changes in medieval times, in order to clear up desperate situations or even to embellish the text. In this field, contributions of particular note have come from Butrica and Günther.⁶⁰ Even though we may often disagree with their choices, it must be recognized that interpolationist criticism carries out a very useful function, by forcing reflection on a convincing interpretation for contexts that have often been neglected.

The same scholars⁶¹ have reinvigorated the Scaligerian transpositional tendency, rather unconvincingly presented in Postgate's edition⁶² and applied more maturely in Richmond's.⁶³ Convinced as he was of the highly perturbed status of the archetype due to the loss and dislocation of entire pages,⁶⁴ and a tenacious supporter of a strophic division of the elegies,⁶⁵ Richmond proposed a Propertian text that was profoundly affected by lacunae and displaced verses, which at a time of rampant conservatism was destined for abject failure. Today Richmond has been completely forgotten, but it may be worth carefully reevaluating some of his proposals, especially those for Book 2.⁶⁶

⁵⁸ Goold (1965) 1–107; (1967) 59–106; (1988) 27–38; (1992) 287–320.

⁵⁹ Jachmann (1935) 193–240; (1951) 179–87; (1955) 414–21; (1957) 39–47; Knoche (1936) 8–63; (1967) 49–70.

⁶⁰ See Butrica (1997) 176–208 and Günther (1997ba) 65–132.

⁶¹ In particular, see Günther (1997b) 1–64.

⁶² Postgate (1894). Severely criticized by Housman (1895) 350–5, Postgate's transpositions did not even meet with the favor of those who, like Richmond, firmly believed in such operations; see Richmond (1928) 4–5: 'certain elegies—for instance, the first of the last book—assumed a shape so far from that given by the manuscripts that the changes could only be accounted for by imagining a scribe armed with scissors, snipping his exemplar into couplets and shuffling them before he made his copy'.

⁶³ Apart from anything else, Richmond can take the credit for bringing into the critical apparatus the lessons of P, which like FL descends from the Petrarchan manuscript; however neither Vo, which he regarded as the source of DV, nor the C family (which Richmond seemed to be able to see a third branch of tradition) should have been introduced.

⁶⁴ He was inspired by Lachmann's results for Lucretius; see Richmond (1928) 5.

⁶⁵ He had been preceded by Phillimore, who had applied a strophic division to a highly conservative text, without paying great attention to numeric equivalents; see Richmond (1928) 6.

⁶⁶ The complete list can be found in Smyth (1970) 173.

However, in my opinion, the most important result of twentieth century Propertian scholarship came with those who stuck by the principle that reconstituting a text always initially implies reconstructing the events that have affected that text, through the history of its representatives. In that sense it seems to me that the research carried out by Heyworth and Butrica have lasting value.⁶⁷ Their analyses show without doubt that the Δ family would be purged from future critical apparatus. Less convincing, on the other hand, was their attempt to identify an independent branch of the tradition to place alongside N and the manuscripts which derive from the Petrarchan; in particular, their hypothesis was decidedly and justifiably refuted by Murgia.⁶⁸

Structural research, along the lines of Lachmann and Richmond, has concentrated on the current Book 2, in an attempt to determine the original composition. The separatists' arguments, by contrast, appear very convincing, led by Heyworth,⁶⁹ Lyne,⁷⁰ and Murgia⁷¹ who have reworked and consolidated the old Lachmannian theory, splitting Book 2 into two parts, clearly demonstrating the inconsistency of the flights of fanciful attempts by the unitarians, invariably based on weak or often nonexistent internal echoes between elegiac couplets. The only reason for uncertainty remains that of the confines of the original Book 2, which Lachmann placed between 2.9 (final elegy of 2A) and 2.10 (first elegy of 2B). More recent scholars now favor 2.11 as the concluding elegy of 2A.

Research on the language and style in Propertius was inaugurated at the beginning of the twentieth century by a poor dissertation from G. Uhlmann;⁷² whereas decisive progress was made by an analysis of the *sermo communis* by Neumann,⁷³ but it was not until Tränkle⁷⁴ that an overall treatment of any value was forthcoming. A totally different fate awaited the research into Propertian poetics, which has defined the image of a poet who was a faithful follower of the Alexandrine poetry, in particular the Callimachean. The contributions

⁶⁷ In particular, see Heyworth (1986a) and Butrica (1984).

⁶⁸ Murgia (2000) 195–222.

⁶⁹ Heyworth (1992) 45–59; (1995) 165–85.

⁷⁰ Lyne (1998a) 21–36; (1998c) 158–81.

⁷¹ Murgia (2000) 147–91.

⁷² Uhlmann (1909).

⁷³ Neumann (1925).

⁷⁴ Tränkle (1960).

of Wimmel, Kambylis, and more recently Álvarez Hernández⁷⁵ have insisted on this aspect, whereas Alan Cameron⁷⁶ has cast grave doubts over whether Propertius actually knew Callimachus in any depth. The jury is still out. It is hoped, however, that critics should look not just to Alexandrine poetry, but also to its ancient and classical Greek counterparts—in particular to the Homeric epos, which plays a key role as a source for Propertian motifs, as well as to tragic poetry.

It is no coincidence that defining the complex literary components has captured critics since the early twentieth century: it is far easier to classify Propertius under love poetry, as set out clearly by Luck, Stroh, Lyne, and Holzberg.⁷⁷ But Propertius' verses should be considered as a *carmen mixti generis*, as there were so many different genres and authors that influenced him: so it comes as no surprise that in the early twentieth century Friedrich Leo⁷⁸ was able to formulate his theory that Propertian elegy is strictly dependent on Comedy. This was Leo's reaction to Rothstein's theory on the originality of Latin first-person erotic elegy: to prove its dependence on the lost tradition of Hellenistic elegy, he emphasized mainly its continuity with the New Comedy, considered to be a link with Hellenistic elegy. Felix Jacoby⁷⁹ attacked Leo's thesis, denying the existence of a Hellenistic first-person erotic elegiac production and underlining the importance of the epigram as a structural component of the elegy. Decades later, Jacoby's intuition was confirmed by Schulz-Vanheyden's careful research into the relationships between Propertian elegy and the Hellenistic epigram;⁸⁰ but the hypothesis of a direct relationship with comedy should not be rejected, as shown by renewed interest in the influence of comedy on Propertian poetry.⁸¹

Paradoxically, an aspect that has not yet been explained is that of the originality of a poet who constantly seems to be indebted to his many models. Wilamowitz dealt very little with Propertius, but he could not avoid doing so in his *Hellenistische Dichtung*. There, however, he should be praised for highlighting the principle, too often

⁷⁵ Wimmel (1960); Kambylis (1965); Álvarez Hernández (1997).

⁷⁶ Cameron (1995) 471–79.

⁷⁷ See Luck (1969); Stroh (1971); Lyne (1980); Holzberg (2001).

⁷⁸ Leo (1900) 604–11.

⁷⁹ Jacoby (1905) 38–105.

⁸⁰ Schulz-Vanheyden (1969).

⁸¹ Yardley (1972) 134–39; (1985) 359–66.

forgotten by modern critics, of the difficulty inherent in comparing the mentality and ethos of Classical and Hellenistic Greek poets with those of Roman poets during the Augustan period.⁸² In this field, various useful observations have been made in the many monographs on Propertius—in particular those that seek to analyze his complex character as well as his poetic production. Among a plethora of often verbose and repetitive volumes, which tend toward paraphrastic and impressionistic criticism, Margareth Hubbard's⁸³ work stands out for her great sensitivity toward the text, for her ability to grasp and discuss the really important issues, and for the refreshing originality of her ideas and the results she obtained.

⁸² Wilamowitz (1962) 235.

⁸³ Hubbard (1975).

PART TWO

THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF PROPERTIUS

CHAPTER TWO

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT OF PROPERTIUS

James Butrica

Propertius is one of a number of classical authors whose survival into the Middle Ages and then into the modern world depended upon a single copy, and one of several rescued for posterity in the valley of the Loire during the so-called Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.¹

There can be few authors, however, for whom the accuracy of the text as transmitted has assumed as much importance as it has in the case of Propertius. All texts have suffered corruption to some degree in their transmission, but rarely has that corruption had so profound an effect upon reception. For example, the text of Propertius reached the Middle Ages shorn of the headings that accompanied it in antiquity, and we now read him in a format invented by a mediaeval bibliophile, with unfortunate consequences for interpretation. Moreover, Propertian scholarship itself has been shaped by the question of how far the corruption extends. On the one hand stands a centuries-old tradition of emending a text regarded as seriously corrupted; on the other, a more recent one that argues for understanding, not correction, and seeks a key that will somehow justify those alleged corruptions on such grounds as psychological penetration, modernist experimentation, or, most recently, the theories of Lacan (Miller 2004). However, as Margaret Hubbard observed, modern readings of Propertius are at odds with the judgment of ancient critics like Quintilian and of ancient poets like Ovid, whose comments uniformly imply elegance and clarity, posing a fundamental dilemma for both editors and readers: how many of the difficulties we find in the text derive from the poet himself, and how many from a particularly unfortunate transmission.²

¹ Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 110–18.

² Hubbard (1975) 1–6; Butrica (1997) 179–81.

The Propertian corpus in antiquity

The text of Propertius as it emerged in the Middle Ages in the archetype of the tradition had unquestionably been deformed from its original character. One of the most consequential accidents was the loss of whatever headings and titles had accompanied the ancient copies that lie behind that archetype. This loss meant that mediaeval readers were forced to recover Propertius' name from the text, and discovered an opportunity to devise a new format for his work.

There can be no doubt that the archetype bore no indication of authorship. In N, the older of our two surviving mediaeval manuscripts (for the mss of Propertius and their *sigla*, see "The Manuscripts of Propertius" below), we find only "Incipit propertius" filled in at a later point by the second scribe, and surely derived from the text itself, since it lacks the *praenomen* Sextus, attested in Donatus' life of Virgil. The first headings to appear in the tradition (nothing certain can be said about the lost ms X) are those in A, our other extant mediaeval manuscript, which begins with "Incipit monobiblos prop-ercii aurelii naute ad tullum." If the archetype had given the poet's name, the author of this heading (who can surely be identified as Richard de Fournival, for whom the ms was copied) would not have been forced to invent the impossible "Propertius Aurelius Nauta."³ "Nauta," incidentally, illustrates the deleterious effect of corruption upon interpretation, since it is evidently derived from the reading *nauita* at 2.24.38, where all editors now accept Beroaldus' conjecture *non ita*. "Aurelius" (perhaps borrowed from Aurelius Prudentius) continued to be part of the poet's name well into the nineteenth century.

Fournival, of course, should likewise be credited with devising the titles that also appear first in A. Propertius himself is unlikely to have composed titles to individual elegies, and the uncertainties of poem division that are apparent throughout the tradition might imply that divisions were marked weakly in the archetype, especially in Book 4.⁴ X appears to have had no titles; its descendants borrow them from descendants of A. N has no titles, and left no space for them except before 3.1 and 4.1, though flourished initials show where

³ For Fournival, see Rouse (1973), Rouse (1979), Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 115–17.

⁴ But surely the general agreement in Books 1, 3, and 4 is against the suggestion of Heyworth (1995) 172 and Murgia (2000) 148 that there were none at all.

poems are intended to begin. The scribe of A also left no space for titles and copied the elegies continuously, again apart from flourished initials; the titles were added only later, once Fournival had composed them. Certainly there is no reason to regard them as ancient. In the extant portion of A, the heading of an elegy normally takes the form of “*Ad*” plus the name of the person addressed (in all the elegies of Book 1 except 3, 16, and 21 this is either Cynthia or a named male); but 1.14 is called *Ad Diuitem* because Fournival had not read as far as line 20, where Tullus is finally named. Where A is lost, clearly impossible titles appear in its descendants, most obviously at 2.22 *Ad Heremium* (from the first line, *scis here mi* [the archetype read *heremi*, without division] *multas pariter placuisse puellas*) and at 3.14 *Ad Spartum* (again from the first line, *multa tuae, Sparte, miramur iura palaestrae*, and obviously the work of someone following non-classical rules of scansion, not to mention unaware of ancient Sparta). By accident, Fournival did introduce a correct heading of sorts to Book 1, at least, when he used “monobiblos” (which he found in Martial, another author in his library), but he did not understand it if, as seems likely, he intended “*Liber secundus*” at 2.1.1 to mean “second book of the monobiblos.”

Thus the designations “Book 1,” “Book 2,” and so on, so firmly entrenched in editions, are only mediaeval interventions, not ancient tradition; they are not evidence for how Propertius arranged his own poetry. Anyone who wants to preserve them, even in modified form (as if Fournival had somehow restored the poet’s original intentions), must argue for them, not assume them, in the face of the relatively plentiful ancient evidence that in fact shows them to be impossible, whether or not Fournival thought that Propertius had written a four-book monobiblos.⁵ In 1816 Karl Lachmann asserted on the basis of supposed internal and external evidence that Propertius must have written five books, not four, with the original Books 2 and 3 accidentally amalgamated into our present Book 2; accordingly, he edited Propertius in five books, beginning Book 3 at 2.10 and renumbering 3 and 4 as 4 and 5, an arrangement that remained standard for much of the nineteenth century. Later scholars assembled ancient citations of Propertius that supposedly confirmed his theory, though without effect on editorial practice; but their arguments were revived

⁵ For what follows cf. Butrica (1996a) 90–99, with references to earlier literature.

in the third quarter of the twentieth century, when Lachmann's division of Book 2 enjoyed renewed popularity, often as a way to explain its disproportionate length.⁶ There is, however, no reason to believe that Propertius wrote any more books of elegies than the four that the manuscript tradition implies.

The earliest witness to the original format of the Propertian corpus is Martial 14.189:

monobiblos Properti
Cynthia, facundi carmen iuuenale Properti,
accepit famam, nec minus ipsa dedit.

Book 14 (where the titles, by the way, come from Martial himself; cf. 14.2.3–4) is a versified catalogue of objects that might be given as gifts at Saturnalia, including several literary works. Since this format requires that the epigram refer to a single specific work, the heading means “*the* monobiblos” of Propertius, not “*a* monobiblos,” and Propertius must have written only one monobiblos if it could be identified this way. Modern scholars adduce many definitions of monobiblos to suit their theories about the Propertian corpus, but only one, suggested both by etymology and by analogy with tribiblos, tetrabiblos, etc., is attested in antiquity: a work complete and self-contained in a single book and a single bookroll. Therefore, whatever Martial was calling the monobiblos could never have been a part of a larger, multiple-book collection; it was a complete, autonomous literary work in its own right. Moreover, if the manuscripts are correct in suggesting only four large blocks of elegies, then the three books that are not the monobiblos must have formed a three-book collection, or tribiblos, since those remaining books can not be redistributed further without creating at least one more monobiblos. As to which book Martial meant, the allusion to “youthful poetry” implies Propertius’ earliest work, which datable references suggest is Book 1.⁷ In addition, the name Cynthia dominates the epigram exactly as it dominates 1.1 and indeed the entire book, and is likely to be the title by which “Book 1” was known. (Propertius 2.24.2, *et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta Foro*, shows that he had previously published something with that title.) Finally, both the symmetrical construction

⁶ Cf. Butrica (1996a) 88, with n. 7, adding Günther (1997a) 6–14, Lyne (1998a), Murgia (2000).

⁷ Cf. Hubbard (1975) 42–24.

of Book 1 and the presence of a self-identifying *sphragis* at the close (1.21–22) imply an aesthetically self-contained work such as we would expect of a monobiblos.

The identification of Book 1 as a monobiblos is further evidence of the inauthenticity of the titles in A; a single-book work can neither *be* a Book 1 nor *contain* a Book 1. Hence, it also shows that Books 1–3 could not have been published together, and that the three-book edition of Ovid's *Amores* could not have been modeled on Propertius 1–3.⁸

The next witnesses to the original arrangement of the Propertian corpus reinforce the implications of Martial's monobiblos by attesting the existence of that multiple-book collection that began with "Book 2." These are a metrical writer who, for convenience, can be called Caesius Bassus.⁹ Scholars seeking examples in a given author frequently cited the first occurrence in their chosen source; therefore, if Propertius wrote four independent books of elegies or a collection of four books, we would expect scholars citing him to adduce either the first example in the earliest book or the first example in the collection as a whole—in either case from Book 1 if possible. But both Bassus and Charisius pass over a relevant example in Book 1, ignore relevant examples in Book 4 (Charisius) or in Books 3 and 4 (Bassus), and present instead an example from Book 2—precisely the situation we should expect if Book 1 was a monobiblos and the remaining books formed a collection from which scholars picked the first available example. Bassus (who adduces Tibullus 1.1.6 in this context rather than 2.1.16) cites Propertius 2.1.2, not 1.1.4, 3.1.20, or 4.1.6, as his Propertian example of how to turn a purely dactylic pentameter into a choriambic by adding a long monosyllable; Charisius, to illustrate Propertius' use of *pulvis* as a feminine rather than masculine noun, cites 2.13.35, not 1.22.6 or 4.9.31.¹⁰ Heyworth (1995) and Murgia (2000) point to anomalies in the way some authors are cited by grammarians, but cases like Ovid or Cicero, where numerous works were available, are not valid comparanda for Propertius, and the consistency with which Bassus and Charisius choose examples

⁸ Williams (1968) 480–95.

⁹ First century; cf. Murgia (2000) 155, n. 19 and the grammarian Charisius (fourth century).

¹⁰ There is perhaps a further example in his choice to illustrate feminine *serta* from 2.33.37 rather than 4.6.3, where Scaliger restored it for the transmitted *cera*.

from Book 2 should not be dismissed as mere coincidence. Propertius probably called this tribiblos *Amores*,¹¹ for the outlines of a literary interpretation of Books 2–4 as a unified collection, cf. Butrica (1996a) 107–57.

Propertius himself refers to its dimensions in its first book, in the famous passage of 2.13 where, among the instructions for his eventual funeral, he expresses a wish to have three books accompany him as gifts for Persephone. Lachmann¹² used 2.13.25 as part of his evidence, citing it as *sat mea sat magna est si tres sint pompa libelli* and arguing that such an affirmation could be made only in a third book. This argument, however, rests upon a faulty restoration of a corrupted line, which was transmitted in the unmetrical form *sat mea sit magna si tres sint pompa libelli* (perhaps a mediaeval interpolation intended to repair another corruption). Whatever Propertius wrote (probably *sat sit magna, mihi si tres sint pompa libelli*), it cannot be the line as cited by Lachmann, since the indicative form *est*, which has been introduced by conjecture, is incompatible with the other verbs in this section (19–23), all jussive subjunctives. The passage is a wish for the future (cf. 2.13.17 *quandocumque igitur mors nostros* [P: *nostros mors NFX*] *claudet ocellos*), not a description of a present reality.¹³

The only witness that appears to stand against this distribution of the four books into a monobiblos (1) and a tribiblos (2–4) and in favor of the arrangement in A is Nonius Marcellus (third to fourth century), who illustrates the verb *secundare* by quoting 3.21.14 from “Propertius elegiarum libro III^o.” Some earlier scholars mistakenly assumed that the *elegiarum libri* implied by this citation were identical with the syntagma that began with Book 2, but that syntagma could not have been called *libri elegiarum* without an intolerable ambiguity, since the monobiblos is also a *liber elegiarum*. It is more likely that Nonius reflects a codex format that combined the monobiblos and tribiblos in a single volume with the label “IV libri elegiarum,” or perhaps the mss have corrupted “tribiblo” by way of an abbreviation “IIIBiblo.”

¹¹ Cf. 2.1.1, *quaeritis unde mihi totiens scribantur Amores*.

¹² Followed by Heyworth (1995) and Murgia (2000).

¹³ Heyworth (1995) 165 cites 2.3.4 *et turpis de te iam liber alter erit* as “belong[ing] to the opening sequence of the second book,” but the prediction implied by the future tense *erit* can not be reconciled with presence in a second book, and I regard the line as interpolated.

The Propertian Corpus from Antiquity to the Middle Ages

The earliest surviving manuscript of Propertius was copied in the years on either side of 1200. To understand what happened to the text between antiquity and the mediaeval revival, we must examine both the progress of corruption in antiquity and the mediaeval reception.

A. At least five kinds of corruption can be detected: miscopying, the (mis)incorporation of corrections and incorporation of glosses, dislocations of lines, errors in poem divisions, and interpolations.

Corruption by miscopying

Our earliest texts of Propertius are three couplets found more or less complete on the walls of Pompeii (2.5.9–10; 3.16.13–14; 4.5.47–48). In every case, there are differences between the *graffito* and the text given by the archetype, and in nearly all of those cases—perhaps even in all of them—it is the *graffito*, not the archetype, that is certainly or probably correct. In 2.5.10, everyone recognizes that Propertius wrote *afuerit* as in the *graffito*, not *affuerit* as in the archetype. In 4.5.47, editors print *dantes . . . pulset* with the mss, but the *graffito* is likely to be right about both the *i*-stem accusative plural *dantis* and about the indicative form *pulsat*, which is flanked by verbs ending in *-et*. In 3.16.13–14, it is again obvious that the *graffito* is right about *ambulet . . . adeo* against *ambulat . . . deo*, but it should also be obvious that it is right in giving *feriat* against *noceat* in the mss (Hubbard (1968) 318–19); only about the case of *Scythiae* in the *graffito* vs *Scythicis* in the mss is any doubt possible. These six lines, then, attracted at least three and possibly as many as seven corruptions, an alarmingly high rate, though no edition has ever acknowledged even the lower level suggested by these *graffiti*. In any case, the *graffiti* do appear to resolve that fundamental problem of Propertian scholarship: we trust our manuscripts to the poet's detriment.

The citations by ancient grammarians¹⁴ also bear witness to the poor quality of our text: 3 of the 9 lines are corrupt in the archetype. We owe *candidus* at 2.3.24 to an unknown Macrobius (*ardidus* mss) and *nexisti* at 3.8.37 to Priscian (*tendisti* mss). The citation of

¹⁴ Butrica (1984) 30–32.

2.14.1 in Charisius, no doubt correctly, lacks the *est* that the mss of Propertius give at the end; the interpolation of *est* with perfect participles is common in mss of Latin poetry, and Propertius does not use *est* with *laetatus* in 2.14.3.

The incorporation of corrections and glosses

Attempts at correction of errors through conjecture can be traced in many individual manuscripts as well as in the archetype itself. In addition, at least one ancestor of the archetype must have contained corrections of scribal errors, to judge by the traces of the incorrect handling of those corrections that persist in the tradition. For example, *puliledamantes* at 3.1.29 (probably representing either *Pulydamanta et* [Lachmann] or *Pulydamantis* [Postgate]) resulted from a corruption *puledamantes* corrected to *pulidamantes* through a superscript *li* which was mistakenly incorporated rather than substituted. The archetype itself contained some corrections, to judge by 1.18.16, where *delectis* in N v^{ls}t, *delictis* in mrus^{vc}, and *dilectis* in A imply *delectis* in the archetype with a superscript *i* correcting to *deiectis* (as in v^t), or 3.12.14, where Propertius wrote *sic redeunt* and the readings *si credunt* in N c and *si credent* in FLPZ mrus imply *si credunt* in the archetype with a superscript *e* (again, only v understood, and corrected the misdivision as well).

Likewise, at least one ancestor of the archetype contained glosses, some of them so corrupt that they must surely be of ancient origin. Very rarely, these are actually preserved in extant mss; for example, *nifeas*, written superscript in N by the scribe himself at 3.13.9, is a corruption of a gloss *feminas*, while the *fase* of v^{mg} at 4.7.57 is a remnant of (*Pasi*)*faes*, a gloss on *Cressae*. Two glosses incorporated in the archetype have already been cited; *noceat* at 3.16.14 began as a gloss on *feriat*, *tendisti* at 3.8.37 as one on *nexisti*. Others include *flumina* in 3.11.51, *fugisti tamen in timidi uada flumina Nili* (hence it is *flumina*, not *uada*, that needs emendation), and 4.11.73, *nunc tibi commendo communia pignora natos*, where *natos* has replaced the vocative *Paulle* (*tibi* needs a referent; *nunc* implies a new addressee, and the last person addressed in the second person was Cornelia's daughter in 67). At 2.28.53 *Troia*, a gloss on *Priami diruta regna senis* in the next line, replaced the corrupt reading of the archetype *hioa* everywhere in the tradition except v. At 2.3.22 the paradosis *carmina quae quiuus non putat aequa suis*, with *uel lyrines* superscript in two descendants of X, is best

understood on the hypothesis that the name of a poetess, probably Erinna, stood in the text (*carminaque Erinnae* etc.) with *uel lyrices cuiusuis* superscript as a gloss, subsequently corrupted to *uel lyrines quuiis*. For 4.4.74–5 as a versified gloss, see Butrica (2000) 472–74.

Dislocations/transpositions

While no two editors agree on how many dislocations have taken place (for the frequency with which they appear in the extant mss, see Butrica (1997) 189–96), there are no editions, not even Phillimore's or Rothstein's, that introduce no transpositions; in particular, everyone seems to agree about the need to shift 1.15.15–16, though not about their proper place (a situation that may point to interpolation, not dislocation, as the source of the problem).

Poem divisions

The unreliability of the poem divisions, both in the archetype and in individual mss, is notorious.¹⁵ Book 1 alone seems to be free of difficulty in this regard at the level of the archetype; whether 1.8 should be divided is a problem that scholars created themselves by failing to notice that 1.11+12, the parallel component in the book's symmetrical structure, was also transmitted as a single poem (Butrica 1996b). Elsewhere it is important to note the difference in kind between the problems in Book 2 and those in 3 and 4. The latter are straightforward examples of misdivision, like the new elegy that begins at 3.15.11, or of failure to divide, such as at 4.6.1. In Book 2, on the other hand, the problems involve extreme difficulties of continuity and coherence in certain stretches in particular, perhaps exemplified best by the number of units that editors regularly break up into 2 or more smaller elegies (2.18, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34) and by the lacunas they posit. The authoritative mss even disagree about the dimensions of these units; though editors print thirty-four elegies, those mss acknowledge only thirty-two in one branch, twenty-seven in another, and they are unanimous in making of 2.33 and 34 a single impossible elegy of one hundred thirty-eight lines. Clearly

¹⁵ Of course it is the former that particularly matter here; see especially Hubbard (1975) 44–45, Heyworth (1995) 171–75, Günther (1997a) 3–38, Butrica (1997) 206–08, Murgia (2000).

this is a more complex phenomenon than the errors that created the minor problems in Books 3 and 4, and not a mere phase of literary experimentation; something drastic has occurred, and the interpolation of non-Propertian material is no more unlikely than the conflation of two separate books.¹⁶

Interpolations

The Propertian corpus has also been affected by the interpolation of verses, both individual couplets and longer passages. A series of distinguished scholars—Knoche, Jachmann, now Zwierlein—has advocated the presence of interpolations, though without winning adherents.¹⁷ One cause is the unrealistically optimistic view of the copying process held by scholars unaccustomed to collating mss; interpolation is in fact a normal part of that process, and can be found in the extant mss (examples at Butrica (1997) 197). In general, these interpolations are either passages cited from other authors or summaries of or comments on the context.¹⁸

a. Propertius himself was the source of two interpolations. The repetition of 1.2.1–2 as 4.5.55–56 is widely (but of course not universally) recognized as an interpolation, written in some margin at this point by someone who was reminded of them by 4.5.57–58. Less obviously, 2.34.65–66, the famous lines on the greatness of Virgil's impending *Aeneid*, have been interpolated from Donatus' biography of Virgil, where the context suggests that they were an impromptu utterance.¹⁹

b. But of course most of the passages interpolated in antiquity must be the work of other authors, now unidentifiable. Some examples are suggested in Butrica (1997) 201–06, such as 2.34.67–84 (the passage on Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, perhaps early Augustan given the high proportion of polysyllabic endings in the pentameters), 3.13.43–46 (a literal translation of an epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum), and 3.14.15–16; another likely case is 3.17.15–18, which if genuine would make Propertius irrelevantly promise Bacchus to pursue viticulture in exchange for his release, in a poem that instead promises Pindaric dithyrambs.

¹⁶ As argued by Heyworth (1995), Günther (1997a), and Murgia (2000).

¹⁷ Cf. Günther (1997a) 67–68.

¹⁸ The kind that has been termed “collaborative”; cf. Tarrant (1987) 1989.

¹⁹ Butrica (1997) 201.

c. There also appear to be whole elegies interpolated into Book 2, helping to account both for its extraordinary length as transmitted (1362 lines) and the obscuring of boundaries between elegies. Certainly no one has ever explained the curious phenomenon that confronts us here when Propertius apparently begins to address people under pseudonyms borrowed from the minor mythological figures Panthus (21), Demophoon (22), and Lynceus (34). There is no parallel in Propertius himself or elsewhere in Latin poetry for addressees with mythological pseudonyms either in an individual poem or throughout a series of poems—and certainly not for their use in only one part of a book (that it should be a part where problems of poem division are especially acute only enhances the suspicion). Given that the verse is clearly classical in meter and style, it would appear that Book 2 has fortuitously incorporated substantial remnants of another ancient elegiac poetry book—Silver threads among the Gold should the author be Propertius' descendant Passennus Paullus, praised by Pliny for writing elegies scarcely distinguishable from Propertius' own (*Ep.* 9.22).

While such arguments might well be regarded as more suggestive than probative, we have objective evidence for regarding 2.15 as an interpolation on the grounds that it contains a word that was not yet in use during Propertius' creative lifetime. The juxtaposition of 2.14 and 15 is anomalous in any case, since it yields a pair of consecutive poems with exactly the same subject matter in which the second seems unaware of the first; contrast the two-part elegies of Book 1 (8; 11+12), or its "paired" elegies (7 and 9; 10 and 13), where some connection is always made between the two components.²⁰ And if one of these elegies is interpolated, it cannot be 2.14, whose first line is quoted by Charisius and attributed to Propertius.²¹ The problematic word in 2.15 is *Actiacus* (*Actiacum mare*, 44). If the poem is genuine, this is its first appearance in Latin poetry; but a substantial difficulty in accepting it is that this occurrence would be absolutely unique, not just for Propertius but for early Augustan poetry as a whole. Otherwise we find only *Actius* there in connection with both Apollo and the battle, with three occurrences in Virgil, one in Horace, and no fewer than five in Propertius himself. At the

²⁰ Davis (1977), Butrica (1996b).

²¹ For the argument that follows, see Butrica (2001) 301–04.

end of the Augustan period, however, Ovid uses *Actiacus* once each in *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* but never *Actius*, and *Actiacus* is all but universal thereafter. This reversal of fortune surely involved something more than mere metrical convenience, and the explanation seems to lie with Augustus himself: he created *Actiacus* as a new cult name of Apollo in connection with the enlargement and rededication of his temple at Actium, or so a corrupt gloss of Servius on *A.* 8.704 seems to have said (the Thilo-Hagen edition prints the impossible *quem postea Actium nominavit Augustus*, but *actium* in mss LH surely points to *Actiacum*; cf. also Serv. *A.* 3.274 *templum Actiaco Apollini constituit*). Scholars agree that the last date recoverable from Propertius is 16 BC, suggested by the reference to an expedition against the Sygambri at 4.6.77, in a poem celebrating the Actian victory and the Palatine temple of Apollo. But we have a coin datable to the very same year, no doubt minted for the same celebration of the *ludi quinquennales* for which Propertius probably wrote 4.6, carrying an image reminiscent of the victory monument at Actium and bearing the legend “*Apollini Actio*,” not “*Actiaco*.” Propertius too calls Apollo *Actius*, not *Actiacus*, when alluding to that very monument in 4.6.67; the moneyer is perhaps even less likely than the poet to have passed over Augustus’ own title for the god if it existed yet.

B. Whether Propertius was read in the Carolingian period is doubtful, but he was certainly read again, and with interest, in the valley of the Loire during the twelfth century.²² That region (specifically the city of Orléans) is the common element uniting most of his five earliest mediaeval readers, namely John of Salisbury (†1180), the annotator of Bern, Burgerbibliothek 276, the author of the comedia called *Pamphilus*, the poet Simon Aureacabra, and the compiler of the *Florilegium Gallicum*. By the thirteenth century his readership had extended only a little further, to Richard de Fournival at Amiens, and from him to the Sorbonne in Paris, from which Petrarch would rekindle interest in Italy.²³

However restricted geographically, the interaction with Propertius was surprisingly intense given the inherent difficulty of an allusive and deeply corrupted text. In his *De septem septenis*,²⁴ John ambitiously

²² Rouse 1979.

²³ For a general discussion of Propertius in the Middle Ages, see Butrica (1984) 20–30.

²⁴ *Patrologia Latina* CIC 945–47; its authenticity has been denied, but on insufficient grounds.

interlaces references to the relationship of Augustus and Propertius as reflected in 2.10 (alluding also to 2.22.21) with an anecdote from Valerius Maximus (3.7.11) concerning the poet Accius and a Julius Caesar that John probably mistook for the dictator. The annotator of the Bern ms (a copy of the *Vocabularium* of Papias) worked in Orléans; he added four lines of Propertius to the margins of his lexicon, and alluded to a fifth. The author of Pamphilus, composed in Orléans, may have imitated Propertius 1.12.5, *consuetos amplexu nutrit amores*, in his own *illicitum complexus nutrit amorem* (237). Simon Aureacakra, a twelfth-century canon of St. Victor in Paris, seems to have been inspired by the archetype's corrupted version of 3.7.42, *in mare cui soli non ualere doli* (on Ulysses' homeward journey), when writing lines 249–50 of his own *Ilias, et Venus huic moli subduxit prouida proli, / huic domui soli nil nocuere doli* (on Aeneas' journey to Italy). Most revealing of all are the extracts taken over into the Florilegium Gallicum, compiled in Orléans (these are now found in Bibl. Vat. Reg. lat. 2120, formerly part of Paris, B.N. lat. 15155). The extracts are remarkable not simply for existing but even more for the amount of annotation they attracted in subsequent years, evidence for the kind of active reading that can promote corruption through dislocations and interpolations, especially in the absence of other copies for comparison. The forty-three lines have fifteen contemporary interlinear glosses, like the sensible “propter laborem” on 2.19.3 (*nullus erit castis iuuenis corruptor in agris*) and the cynical “utilitatem” on *pondus* in 2.25.22 (*nulla diu femina pondus habet*), and the same number of later marginal comments, like “Amor vult blandicias” linking 1.9.12, 1.12.16, and 1.14.8, and “contra falsos amatores” at 2.34.3. They also offer a microcosmic view of the entire process of corruption, with an interpolated couplet of mediaeval origin, some potential interpolations, and a dislocation.²⁵ Not long after, Fournival adorned his Propertius with headings and titles, and three different hands subsequently added notes; someone else extracted 82 lines from it for a florilegium while it resided at the Sorbonne (“flosculi propercii tibulli de amore,” on ff. 24^v–26 of Paris, B.N. lat. 16708). Where Propertius was read by Albert of Stade, if Albert did indeed read him, cannot be guessed, but Propertius' *piscibus esca natat*, of the shipwrecked Paetus at 3.7.8, is the only possible classical model for his

²⁵ Cf. Butrica (1997) 198–99.

piscibus esca datur, used of Ajax' shipwrecked comrades, at 8.600 of his *Troilus*, composed in 1249 (and also, in a different context, at 1.512).

It is impossible to judge precisely how much corruption took place in antiquity and how much in the Middle Ages. One suspects that the majority of transcriptional errors happened in the transition from an ancient copy (perhaps in a difficult script) to the archetype, but some of the interpolations at least are probably of mediaeval origin, particularly those consisting of comments, commonplaces, and summaries; some examples are suggested at Butrica (1997) 199–201, including 2.1.15–16 (*seu quicquid fecit siue est quodcumque locuta, / maxima de nihilo nascitur historia*) and the irrelevant and ungrammatical 3.13.23–24 (*hoc genus infidum nuptarum, hic nulla puella / nec fida Euadne nec pia Penelope*).

The Manuscripts of Propertius

The archetype of the Propertian tradition, now lost, eventually generated a substantial number of descendants, of which just under 150 survive, nearly all of them copied in the period 1425–1500.²⁶ The tradition as a whole, apart from N and A, is important testimony to the reception of Propertius in the Italian Renaissance. The fact that Propertius was initially available only in Florence and in copies of poor quality significantly delayed both scholarly work and literary reception, and it was only the arrival of X around 1425 that allowed it to begin in earnest (though it was unfortunate that the descendant of X most influential in the fifteenth century was seriously corrupted). Nevertheless, anonymous scholars like the authors of the corrections in the epsilon and eta mss and identifiable figures like Pacificus Maximus, Franciscus Maturantius, and above all Johannes Jovianus Pontanus soon successfully emended many dozens of passages corrupt in the archetype.²⁷ The first commentaries were probably being prepared in Rome as early as the 1460s.²⁸ All in all, the mss are a better reflection on fifteenth-century scholarship than the

²⁶ For a catalogue of the known manuscripts cf. Butrica (1984) 205–334; for their affiliation, cf. Butrica (1984) 37–169, Heyworth (1986a).

²⁷ For an appraisal of the progress of correction, and a challenge to the notion that the *Itali* emended Propertius irresponsibly, cf. Butrica (2002) 374–88.

²⁸ Butrica (1999) 211.

casually edited incunabula,²⁹ with the exception of course of Beroaldus, the first serious commentator in print. Despite the effort at correction and interpretation, however, Propertius probably never became a truly “popular” author; no ms shows any sign of having been given as a gift to a friend or lover, though some extant mss of Tibullus (for example) certainly were. The difficulties of the text may also account for the rarity with which it is illustrated explicitly; the only examples appear to be Cupid standing on the chest of a supine man (cf. 1.1.4) in Milan, Bibl. Ambrosiana I 67 sup. (Milan or Pavia, ca. 1470) and the drowning Cynthia (cf. 2.26) on f. 1 of Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Diez B. Sant. 57 (Ferrara, 1481).

Since the Propertian tradition involves an archetype, editing begins with its reconstruction. However, there is as yet no critical edition that cites the readings of X as advocated by Butrica (1984) and Heyworth (1986a).³⁰ Moreover, current editions still use the delta mss DVVo, which have now been shown to lack independent access to the archetype,³¹ pointlessly cite the readings of F and P where A is extant, and clog the *apparatus criticus* with irrelevant corrections in the major manuscripts.

There is little of use to the editor in the few mediaeval sources independent of the full-manuscript tradition. The four lines quoted in Bern 276 agree completely with the text of the archetype (Butrica (1984) 26–27), while the forty-three lines in Reg. lat. 2120 disagree only in their obvious corruptions, apart from *amat for habet* at 2.1.58.³² This reading is shared with the other mediaeval florilegium in Paris, B.N. lat. 16708, but only by coincidence; A, the source of those *flosculi*, is extant here and reads *habet* with the other authoritative mss.

Fourteen witnesses are available for the reconstruction of the archetype, representing perhaps three lines of descent. The three probable descendants of the archetype are N, A, and X: the Neapolitanus (N), Fournival’s manuscript (A), and a lost manuscript that Poggio Bracciolini brought to Florence in the 1420s (X). The exact relationship of NAX to each other and to the archetype is uncertain. If X is, as Heyworth has suggested, the archetype itself, then N and A will be independent copies of it. If X is not the archetype, then

²⁹ For which see Butrica (1984) 159–69, Rose (2001) 151–276.

³⁰ But see the sample texts of 1.20, 2.8, 3.6, and 4.11 in Butrica (1984).

³¹ Butrica (1984) 119–31.

³² Butrica (1984) 25–26, with nn. 20–22, Heyworth (1986a) 39.

NAX are three independent copies, though it is also possible that N and X share a common intermediate source. Unfortunately, the nature of the evidence may never allow a definitive answer. For example, *his* in 1.20.51 shows that the first word in 1.20.1 was *haec*, not *hoc* (NX) or *nec* (A): is *hoc* a conjunctive error of NX, or a reading of the archetype corrupted in A—or did the archetype contain a variant reading, or perhaps a correction? At 3.19.12 *a(b)iegnō* is evidently a conjunctive error of NX—unless *abiegnae* in FLPZ (descendants of A, which is lost here) is a smart conjecture by Petrarch.

N (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek Gudianus latinus 224) was first called the Neapolitanus by Nicolaus Heinsius, who collated it in Naples not long before 1662, when it was presumably purchased there by the Marquard Gude (hence “Gudianus”).³³ This is the oldest (more or less) complete manuscript of Propertius, lacking only 4.11.17–76 because of the excision of a folio. Little more can be said of it other than that it was probably written somewhere in north-central France around 1200; in fact, a number of mysteries still cling to it, such as its exact provenance (the connection with Metz is fragile at best), the significance of the letters in the margins that end at f. 37^r (perhaps the remains of ancient annotations), and the meaning of various markings on the last folio. It is a surprisingly shabby little codex, on parchment of such poor quality that the second scribe twice had to write around a gaping hole; but it preserves the text of the archetype more accurately than any other extant copy (though still somewhat imperfectly). The late correcting hands can be ignored, but not the corrections made by the first scribe, who presumably corrected from the exemplar (Barber’s OCT, for example, fails to note the disconcerting fact that *mea* was corrected to *tua* at 1.21.10). N had virtually no effect upon the fifteenth-century tradition; it may have been taken eventually to Naples by Aulus Janus Parrhasius, but its influence is confined to a trio of mss copied in Milan or Pavia ca. 1470.

The very early Italian tradition derives from a far less accurate representative, A (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek Voss. lat. O.38), copied about 1240 for the library of Richard de Fournival. As far as 2.1.63, the editor needs only N and A along with the descendants of X (though two of A’s descendants, F and P, can be cited

³³ Fedeli (1985a) contains an introduction and a complete photographic facsimile.

here when they or their annotators are the first to correct an error of the archetype); but the remainder of A is lost, and its text then must be reconstructed. The florilegium derived from A is an obvious source that editors have not exploited.³⁴ So far, they have used the three mss FLP, but a fourth is also available (Z). All of these derive from A via a lost copy that was very probably made by Petrarch himself (some annotations perhaps in his hand are still to be found in A, though they have all been erased so thoroughly that they are barely visible even under ultraviolet light). Only F (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana pl. 36, 49, written about 1380) is a direct copy of Petrarch's ms, though its value is seriously vitiated by the scribe's incompetence. Ullman demonstrated its connection with Petrarch by identifying one annotator as his friend Lombardo della Seta and another as Colluccio Salutati, whose *ex libris* is found on f. 73^v and who is known from his correspondence to have been seeking a copy of Petrarch's Propertius in the 1370s (some of the notes in the margins have since been demonstrated to be of Petrarchan origin). The editor needs to report the readings of F2, which is Lombardo correcting the copyist's errors from his exemplar or adding annotations and conjectures of Petrarch like *quos* at 3.8.27 and *torui* at 3.18.24; but there is no reason to report F3, the conjectures of Salutati, unless the editor deems them correct, and F4 can be ignored, since its readings derive from an identifiable group of manuscripts.

The other three mss represent either one or two lines of descent from Petrarch's copy. Certainly LP share a source not to be identified with Petrarch's ms; for example, both contain versions of a note, of which there is no sign in F, comprising the words "Iste est Propertius de quo Ovidius Naso" and one or more references to Ovid.

L (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Holkham misc 36) was completed by Giovanni Campofregoso of Genoa on 10 October 1421. This is probably the least unreliable of the descendants, more accurate than F, less corrected than P, though still altered through conjecture from time to time. L is incomplete, however, beginning now at 2.21.3, but we can form some impression of its readings in 2.1.64–2.21.2 from b (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er} 14638) and n (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale IV.F.19), both deriving from a conflation of a ms closely related to LP with the ms v discussed below.

³⁴ Cf. Butrica (1984) 38–39, with n. 4.

P (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7989, copied by an anonymous scholar in the autumn of 1423) is the first ms to combine Propertius with Tibullus and Catullus. It would be an important ms even without its Propertius, since it also preserves our only continuous text of the *Cena Trimalchionis* episode of the *Satyricon*. The presence of Petronius has enabled scholars to connect P with Poggio and with Florence; and these connections are evidently confirmed by the fact that P was soon corrected by its scribe from a source that appears to have been Poggio's ms X. The scribe of P introduced a number of corrections both at the time of copying (such as the invention of 1.12 as a separate poem) and afterward, and the fact that he sometimes corrected through erasure can make it difficult for the editor to recover the all-important original reading.

Finally, Z (Venice, Biblioteca Marciana Fondo antico 443, copied in 1453, perhaps by Giovanni Marcanova) appears from some of its readings to derive from Petrarch's ms independently of both F and LP (Butrica (1984) 51; note, for example, that *amnis* at 3.22.1 is more likely to be a corruption of the archetypal *annus* than of the correction *annos* present in LP), but it might also be possible to explain the agreements of FZ against LP by assuming correction in the source of LP; in any case, Z has not been shown to derive from any extant ms, and from 2.29, where it deserts a text affiliated with the delta mss, it can be cited as an independent witness to A.

The third branch comprises the descendants of X, the ms of Poggio whose arrival in Florence marked the real beginning of the study of Propertius in the Renaissance.³⁵ X is likely to have been, like N, written in a later Carolingian script, to judge by the form of the letter *m* that at 3.11.14 was mistaken by one of its descendants for the 9-shaped abbreviation of *con-*. The earliest witness is v (Vat. lat. 3273), written by the historian and poet Antonio Beccadelli, probably in 1427. A second witness is constituted by a group of three manuscripts with a common intermediate source, perhaps a copy of X made for or by Niccolò Niccoli (m = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8233, a. 1465; r = Bibliotheca Bodmeriana Bodmerianus Lat. 141, a. 1466; u = Biblioteca Vaticana Urb. lat. 641, ca. 1465–1470: m and u are currently used by editors to supplement the text of N in 4.11.17–76). Another descendant is s (Munich, Universitätsbibliothek

³⁵ For Poggio's ms and its descendants see also Heyworth 1986a, where different *sigla* are proposed

Cim. 22, written ca. 1460–1470, probably by Poggio's son Jacopo), while the last is c (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 15), copied by Pomponio Leto in 1470 or 1471. X was collated by Poliziano while in the possession of Berardino Valla (the collation, unfortunately, is lost), and like N made its way to Naples late in the fifteenth century. All of the descendants of X are capable of preserving important readings of the archetype, or clues to readings, but they are also subject to a fair degree of both selection and correction by their scholar-scribes; there is no reason to doubt, as Murgia (2000) 195–222 does, that the scholar-scribes of v, of the common source of mru, of s, and of c all had the same heavily annotated mediaeval ms before them but “edited” it differently.

Murgia also argues that X was really a descendant of Petrarch's ms corrected from N, impugning such survivals from the archetype as *uel lyrynes* at 2.3.22 and *hioa* at 2.28.53 as possibly “variants” in Petrarch's ms or a copy of it ignored by every other descendant. The former is allegedly a corruption of a gloss suggesting a Greek termination for *Corinnae* in 2.3.21, the latter a reference to Hesiod's *Ehoiai*, but it is unrealistic to imagine that notes of this kind were introduced in the fourteenth or even the beginning of the fifteenth century: we are indeed facing fragments of tradition preserved from antiquity that establish the independence and the value of X (other examples include 3.3.32 *punuca* v^l, 3.8.13 *gregis* mru, 3.20.8 *ariachia* mrus).

Two additional sources might yield readings of X lost from vmrusc. One is P, which was corrected from X at an early date; previous scholars have posited N as the source of these readings, but a case like 4.10.18 is decisive, with *aporco* in N and FLP^lZ but *aprico* in vmrusc and P^l. The second is a group of mss, including Parma, Biblioteca Palatina 140 (Florence, ca. 1430–1440), that combine a text derived from X independently of vmrusc with one derived from Petrarch's ms; Heyworth proposes to cite one of them in his *apparatus criticus*, Wrocław, Bibl. Uniwersytecka AKC 1948 KN 197 (much discussed ca. 1900 as the “codex Lusaticus”).

The presence of some degree of correction in nearly all the witnesses calls for the greatest prudence and judgment on the part of the editor when reconstructing A (from FbnP in 2.1.64–2.21.2, from FLP in 2.21.3–2.28, and from FLPZ in 2.29–4.11), when reconstructing X throughout, and when reconstructing the archetype, with whatever glosses and corrections it contained. Once that is done, the formidable task of emendation begins.

CHAPTER THREE

PROPERTIAN TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND EDITING

Richard Tarrant

How Many Propertii?

Only a handful of expressions originating in the field of textual criticism have passed into general circulation among classicists: Richard Bentley's appeal to "ratio et res ipsa" is one, and Giorgio Pasquali's "recentiores, non deteriores" another. To this select group belongs as well J. S. Phillimore's epigram "quot editores tot Propertii." In its original context, the preface to his 1901 OCT edition, it was meant as a dire warning of the chaos that would ensue if editors resorted to large-scale transposition and other radical departures from the transmitted text, but it has often been used to describe the actual state of Propertian editing.

Though couched as a warning for the future, Phillimore's remark was in fact directed at the previous two decades of Propertian studies, in particular the 1894 edition of J. P. Postgate (in his *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*) and several articles of A. E. Housman; both had proposed complex rearrangements of couplets, some of which presumed the displacement of text over large distances.

For much of the twentieth century, Phillimore's caveat might seem to have deterred extremism in editing Propertius. Just one edition fully realized his vision of a text that only its editor could recognize as Propertius, that of O. L. Richmond (1928). Richmond hypothesized an ancient archetype with sixteen lines to a page and postulated that Propertius composed in numerically balanced blocks of text; those assumptions, combined with a willingness to shift entire poems from one book to another and to posit the loss of a thousand lines of text, produced the most eccentric edition of Propertius thus far seen and some of the most damning reviews in the history of Propertian scholarship.¹

¹ E.g., Barber (1929), Jacoby (1930).

Most of the century could be described as a time of consolidation and consensus: it was admitted that the text of Propertius was highly problematic, but editors confined their alterations to a core of widely accepted conjectures—a not insignificant number, but a small fraction of the several thousand emendations proposed since the Renaissance.² Among the products of such an approach are the text and commentary of H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber (1933), Barber's OCT edition (1953, second edition 1960), and the Teubner (Stuttgart) text of Paolo Fedeli (1984). Even D. R. Shackleton Bailey's *Propertiana* (1956), the most important contribution since Housman, abjured a radical approach to emendation and took a distinctly conservative line with regard to transposition and interpolation.

A partial exception is the 1979 Teubner (Leipzig) edition of Rudolf Hanslik, which adopted a more interventionist approach to the text than its predecessors; Hanslik's editorial judgments, however, were thought too flawed for his text to have exerted much influence on the course of Propertian editing.³ Hanslik's contribution lies in his fuller reporting of fifteenth-century witnesses, which permits more precise attribution of readings within the later manuscript tradition and occasionally shows that a reading previously known as a conjecture has manuscript attestation.

The standard critical editions are currently those of Barber and Fedeli.⁴ The texts they print are not vastly different, but the editions differ obviously in format and more subtly in underlying approach. Barber presents a relatively conservative text accompanied by a lean and what might be called a "strong" apparatus, in which the conjectures cited are meant to be seen as serious possibilities; the transmitted text is generally given the benefit of the doubt, but the apparatus shows that the text printed is open to question at many points. Fedeli's text is somewhat more conservative than Barber's, and his apparatus is the antithesis of Barber's: almost a textual commentary with bibliographical references and discussions, its primary aim is to justify Fedeli's adherence to the transmitted text. It is no coincidence that two of the words that appear most frequently in it

² Census of conjectures in Smyth (1970).

³ See Kenney (1981), La Penna (1982).

⁴ For assessments of Fedeli's edition, see Heyworth (1985), La Penna (1988). They agree that Fedeli did not markedly improve on Barber.

are *sed* and *tamen*, used to explain why an attractive conjecture is not in fact compelling.

In 1977 Gian Carlo Giardina opined that scholars had established a “vulgate” text of Propertius and had thereby disproven Phillimore’s gloomy prediction;⁵ almost a decade later, Giuseppe Giangrande asserted that the task of Propertian textual criticism was now to refine the vulgate text as represented by the editions of Barber and Fedeli.⁶ In 1987 Fedeli himself observed—with patent relief—that Housman-style madness had been put to rest and that a cautiously conservative approach was now the norm.⁷ Even as he wrote, however, a powerful resurgence of skepticism⁸ was gathering strength. Among the harbingers of change were two doctoral dissertations on the manuscript tradition, one by James Butrica in Toronto and the other by Stephen Heyworth in Cambridge. Although principally concerned with untangling the fifteenth-century transmission, both dissertations represented preliminary stages of projected editions—for Butrica a text and commentary of Book 3, and for Heyworth a new OCT edition to replace Barber. Both scholars took a markedly skeptical line, and in subsequent studies they have developed the case for an interventionist approach in editing Propertius.⁹

In 1990 came George Goold’s edition in the Loeb Classical Library series. Goold had expressed radically skeptical views on the text of Propertius as early as the mid-1960s,¹⁰ and his edition, although more moderate than some of his *Vorarbeiten* might have led one to expect, departed from the manuscript text accepted by Barber and Fedeli in well over three hundred passages. It was hailed by a new generation of skeptics as pointing the way to a thorough revision of the text.¹¹ Goold’s edition was followed in 1997 by Hans-Christian

⁵ Giardina (1977) viii.

⁶ Giangrande (1986) 212, cited by Butrica (1997) 178.

⁷ Fedeli (1987) 108 (“sopiti ormai i furori di tipo housmaniano”), cited by Butrica (1997) 179.

⁸ I use the terms “skepticism,” “skeptic,” and “skeptical” to characterize an approach that places little trust in the transmitted text and is willing to consider drastic alterations to it.

⁹ The main publications are Butrica (1997), Heyworth (1995a), (1995b).

¹⁰ See in particular Goold (1966).

¹¹ Butrica (1992) 48 “simply the best text seen since the elegies emerged from the obscurity of the Middle Ages”; Günther (1997b) 7 „zwar ist durch den hervorragenden neuen Loebtext Goolds . . . ein ungeheurer Fortschritt erzielt worden.“

Günther's *Quaestiones Propertianae*, which argued forcefully that transposition and interpolation should be seen as significant phenomena in the transmitted text.

The next major contribution will be Heyworth's OCT edition, scheduled to appear at almost the same time as the present volume. It will go further in a skeptical direction than Goold, and in its division of Book 2 and in other respects will resemble Lachmann's edition more than any of its recent predecessors.¹²

As a result of the recent revival of skeptical criticism, the questions first raised by nineteenth-century critics beginning with Lachmann are once more open for discussion. The following brief survey cannot claim to be entirely objective, partly because of my personal ties to several prominent skeptics and partly because my own critical outlook inclines me toward skepticism. Every author and transmission, however, calls for treatment on its own terms, and the case of Propertius seems to me to require a combination of boldness and caution that makes the labels "conservative" and "skeptical" appear too one-dimensional.

A frequent point of departure for skeptical critics is the impression of Propertius' writing conveyed by comments in other Latin poets—Ovid in particular, who refers to *blandi praecepta Properti* (*Tr.* 2.465) and *blandi . . . Propertius oris* (*Tr.* 5.1.17), and ancient critics—most notably Quintilian, who regarded Tibullus as the most polished and elegant of writers of elegy but allowed that some preferred Propertius, presumably on the same criteria.¹³ Those capsule descriptions suggest a poet of urbanity and grace, and give no support to the widespread modern image of Propertius as a difficult and often obscure writer.¹⁴ Since the modern conception accurately reflects the evidence of our manuscripts but contradicts the impression given by ancient writers—so the skeptical argument goes—we must conclude that the manuscript tradition has seriously falsified Propertius' original words.¹⁵

¹² I am very grateful to Stephen Heyworth for providing information about his edition and for helpful discussion of some controverted issues.

¹³ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93 *elegia . . . cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime uidetur auctor Tibullus. Sunt qui Propertium malint.*

¹⁴ Another of Propertius' own words could be enlisted in this connection: *molliter ire pedes* ("how the feet move smoothly") in 2.12.24, literally describing his mistress's walk, is also a metapoetic self-description.

¹⁵ Hubbard (1975) 1–7, Butrica (1997) 179–81.

The proposition that our manuscripts offer a text widely at variance with the author's is not inconsistent with the nature of Propertius' transmission. His poetry does not appear to have been widely read in late antiquity or in the Carolingian period, and it did not enjoy the protection that comes from being a school author or the subject of an ancient commentary. Indeed, it is almost certain that all the medieval manuscripts descend from a single ancient copy. Derivation from a single ancient manuscript does not in itself entail a highly corrupt text: the first six books of Tacitus' *Annales* are extant in a single ninth-century copy of an ancient codex, and as far as we can judge both exemplar and copy were written with considerable care. It does mean, however, that if the sole surviving ancient copy was highly corrupt and/or damaged, its flaws will be found in all extant manuscripts; that appears to be the case with Ovid's *Heroides*, where an often corrupt and perhaps extensively interpolated copy underlies the entire medieval tradition.

One problem with basing one's view of Propertius on ancient critical judgments is that they are so general in their phrasing that they make Propertius sound indistinguishable from Tibullus or Ovid, and I doubt that even the most interventionist of his editors would advocate emending Propertius to the point where he could be mistaken for Tibullus or Ovid.¹⁶

Another difficulty with the hypothesis of widespread scribal deformation is that it posits a most unusual type of textual disfigurement. There is nothing implausible in the notion of a Propertian archetype containing a high degree of textual corruption, but even exceptionally careless copying would not so often turn limpidly clear verse into the knotty writing that our manuscripts present. The tradition of Tibullus is also late, narrow, and unprotected by scholastic use or commentary, and there is more textual uncertainty in Tibullus than, say, Postgate's OCT text would suggest, but the corruptions that have crept in do not seriously alter the overall impression of a lucid and affectedly simple style. To explain what some skeptics believe has happened in the transmission of Propertius requires a *Bearbeiter* of a remarkably perverse kind, a rogue copyist who willfully rewrote and disarranged the poems.¹⁷

¹⁶ The problem was faced candidly by Hubbard (1975) 5: "No doubt Propertius was more like, say, Ovid than his manuscripts suggest; but how much more like?"

¹⁷ In Goold's words, "a pseudo editor whose crazy notions have driven him to ruthless rewording": Goold (1966) 87.

An example will illustrate both the kind of rewriting postulated by skeptical critics and the problems it entails. In the opening couplets of 4.11, the recently deceased Cornelia tells her husband Paullus that his tears are in vain, since nothing can now restore her to life. Lines 3–4 are transmitted as follows: *cum semel infernas intrarunt funera leges, / non exorato stant adamante uiae*. Goold questioned the logic of *intrare leges*, arguing that *intrare* must have as object a noun designating a place; the obvious conjecture is *sedes*, apparently first made by Heinsius.¹⁸ But is it so difficult to understand *intrare leges* as combining the ideas of entering the Underworld and coming under its jurisdiction? Such use of language seems consistent with Propertian practice: compare, for example, 4.8.4 *tam rarae non perit hora morae*, where *mora* simultaneously refers to the time spent on a visit and to the point of interest that is the reason for the visit. Certainly the stretch required does not seem greater than in 3.3.1–4 *uisus eram . . . reges, Alba, tuos . . . neruis hiscere posse meis*, where the notion of “telling” or “proclaiming” must be supplied from *hiscere* (literally “to open my mouth”).¹⁹ Furthermore, if Propertius had written *intrarunt funera sedes*, there would have been no reason to alter the text; nor does it seem plausible that a mechanical confusion of *S* and *L* could have generated so apt and evocative a reading as *leges*. One example cannot sustain a broader conclusion, but this case does suggest that the theory of scribal interference calls for closer scrutiny.

The Propertian archetype was undoubtedly a wretched affair, defaced by scribal error and botched attempts at correction.²⁰ I will illustrate some of its typical flaws using passages in which there can be little or no question about the original reading. (The symbol > is used for “corrupted to.”)

(a) misreading or inversion of letters:

3.8.29 29 *Graia* (Fruter) > *grata*

3.10.1 *quidnam uisissent* (Heinsius) > *quidnam misissent*

3.23.22 *diuitiis ligna* (Beroaldus) > *diuitiis signa*

3.8.19 *uertas* (Vahlen) > *uersat*²¹

¹⁸ Goold (1966) 90–91; *sedes* is adopted in the Loeb text. In a rare reversal of editorial roles, Fedeli calls *sedes* “*fort. recte*” while Barber does not mention it in his apparatus.

¹⁹ See Camps *ad loc.*; suggested replacements for *hiscere* include *dicere* (Hemsterhuys) and *ducere* (Heinsius).

²⁰ Günther (1997a) 113 n. 221 lists many examples.

²¹ Inversion of this sort was abundantly documented by Housman (1903) lvi–lvii.

(b) errors of inattention, e.g., replacing letters or words with ones found in the immediate vicinity:

2.3.24 *candidus argutum* (Macrobius *GLK* 5.626.15) > *ardidus/adridus/arridus argutum*

3.6.30 *uitta toro* or *rogo* (Heinsius) > *uitta uiro*

3.9.16 *uendit ab* (Barber) > *uindicat* (from 12)²²

3.17.24 *rapta greges* (Scaliger) > *grata greges*

4.6.3 *serta . . . certet* (Scaliger) > *cera . . . certet*

36 *deae* (ed. Eton. > *lyrae* (from end of 32)²³

(c) banalizations, i.e., replacement of less familiar with more familiar words, at times in blatant defiance of context:

3.3.42 *flare* (Fruter) > *flere*

3.13.30 *uimineos* (Fruter) > *uirgineos*

3.21.8 *amicta* (Scaliger) > *amica*

25 *stadiis* (Fontein) > *studiis* (with *studium* in 27)

4.5.74 *clatra* (Beroaldus) > *caltra, cultra*

4.8.15 *mannis* (Beroaldus) > *ab annis*²⁴

(d) misconstrued syntax arising from the scribal habit of wrongly connecting nearby words:

3.9.57 *mollia* (Broekhuysen) *tu coeptae fautor cape lora iuuentae* > *mollis* (to agree with *tu* and *fautor*)

3.11.23 *et duo in aduersum mitti* (Tyrell) *per moenia currus* > *missi* (false agreement with *currus*)

3.13.42 *praebebant uestri uerba benigna foci* (*uestri . . . foci* Barber: *-is . . . -is* MSS, to provide *praebebant* with a dative)

Some corruptions involve more than one stage, as in cases where an initial misreading has triggered a subsequent alteration:

²² Unfamiliarity with the idiomatic use of *uendere* (to “sell” something by speaking highly of it) may have contributed to the repetition of *uindicat*.

²³ Another likely example is 4.11.93 *lenire senectam* (Schrader) > *sentire senectam*.

²⁴ The tendency to substitute common for less common words may also be at work where forms of *omnis* and *totus* have been justly suspected but the original reading is not clear, e.g., 1.16.38 *tota*] *probra* or *pota* Heinsius, 3.13.35 *totos*] *stratos* Bachrens, *tectos* nescioquis, 3.18.14 *omnia gesta*] *omina festa* Shackleton Bailey, 19 *omnia magnis*] *ostris smaragdus* Housman.

3.3.21 *praescriptos eucta pagina gyros* (Lipsius) > *praescripto seuecta p. gyro*. Faulty word-division led to adjustment of *gyros* to *gyro*.

3.6.27 *turgentis sanie* (Heinsius) *portenta rubetae* > *turgentis ranae*. TVR GENTISSANIE may have been misread by haplography as *turgentis anie*, and the nonsensical *anie* “corrected” to *ranae*, perhaps already present in the vicinity as a gloss on *rubetae*; Pliny twice speaks of the *rubeta* as a species of *ranae* (*N.H.* 11.281, 32.50).

3.5.14 *nudus at* (Schrader) or *in* (Barber) *inferna, stulte, uehere rate* > *ad infernas . . . rates*. Once *ad* had replaced *in* or *at* by repetition from the end of the previous line, *Acherontis ad undas*, the case ending of *inferna . . . rate* was adjusted.

Some errors that lack an obvious cause may have arisen from mistaken scribal recollection. One such type has recently been dubbed “error Wattianus” by the late W. S. Watt: one of two words that appear in close conjunction is later repeated and the scribe repeats the wrong word.²⁵ A clear case is Juvenal 9.54 *cui tot montis, tot praedia seruas*, where the manuscripts divide between *tot praedia* and *cui praedia*. Watt speculates that in Propertius 3.7.60 *attulimus longas in freta uestra comas* (Oudendorp) > *manus, manus* arose from a recollection of 2.2.5 *fulua coma est longaeque manus* and that the substitution was made easier by the fact that *manus* is there modified by *longae*.

That small sampling of errors in the archetype shows that critics of Propertius are faced with a highly fallible manuscript tradition.²⁶ What we have not yet seen, however, is evidence that textual corruption has turned a lucid and elegant poet into a devotee of obscure and difficult writing. In fact, the most common effect of the corruptions surveyed is to render Propertius banal, flat, or pointless—which is what one would expect from the usual processes of miscopying and attendant adjustments. A next step is to ask whether the same can be said about the passages in which Goold adopts conjectures not printed by Barber or Fedeli. I believe that in a significant number of places the answer is yes, and offer the following examples.

²⁵ Watt (2004) 659–60.

²⁶ Other instances of corruption in the archetype are revealed by a superior text preserved in an indirect source: see Butrica (1997) 181–83.

2.20.35 *hoc mihi perpetuo ius est*] *haec . . . laus* Housman

The transmitted text is explained as meaning “this is my rule” (Camps), *hanc morem sequor* (Paley), but Housman’s *laus* coheres better with the lover’s earlier boasts of *fides* and *grauitas* (14, 15–17, 34) and makes something pointed of the following *solus amator*.

2.22.44 [*quid iuuat haec nullo ponere uerba loco*] *n. pondere u. loqui* Beroaldus. The phrase *nullo ponere loco* is glossed by Camps as “to treat as of no account,” but he can cite no other example, and his closest parallel, Cic. *Fin.* 2.90 *Socratem qui uoluptatem nullo loco numerat*, contains in *numerat* a reference to ranking that is missing in *ponere*. Beroaldus’ conjecture gives the line an appropriate point.

2.34.19–20 *ipse meae solus, quod nil est, aemulor umbrae, / stultus quod stulto saepe timore tremo*] *nullo saepe* Heinsius
The combination *stultus*—*stulto* is intolerably insipid, and the repetition of a word from the immediate context is one of the most frequent forms of error in this transmission. Heinsius’ *nullo* also elegantly varies *quod nil est* in the hexameter.

3.5.2 *stant mihi cum domina proelia dura mea*] *sat* Liuiineius

The manuscript text can be rendered “harsh battles are joined between me and my mistress,” but that hardly provides an effective counterpoint to the hexameter’s emphasis on peace; the conjecture *sat* neatly contrasts the lover’s warfare with the real thing (as 3.5.1 *pacis Amor deus est* recalls 3.4.1 *arma deus Caesar*), and the error is easily explained by a desire to give *proelia* a verb.

4.4.34 [*dum captiua mei conspicer esse Tati*] *ora Tati* Gronouius

Defenders of the manuscript text content themselves with showing that *conspici* can be used in a passive sense, but the most cogent objection to *conspicer esse* is rhetorical, that it adds little to the foregoing *utinam ad uestros sedeam captiua Penates*, and that the stress on being seen is unhelpful: “if only I might be looked at as my Tatius’ captive” is weak in comparison to, e.g., “if only I might be called my Tatius’ captive.” Gronovius’ *ora* gives Tarpeia something precious in return for her loss of freedom, the ability to look upon the face of her captor. If *ora* had been omitted because of the preceding *conspicer*, *esse* could have been added to repair the meter.

Even some corruptions that seem to call for stronger measures do not presuppose more than normally negligent scribal behavior (normal for this tradition, at least).

4.4.49–50 *lubrica tota uia est et perfida: quippe tacentis
fallaci celat limite semper aquas.*

tacentis] latentis *Rossberg*

semper] caespes *Palmer*

Goold (1966) 88 points out that *tacens* with verbal force, “keeping silent,” is not simply synonymous with *tacitus*. Rossberg’s *latentis* coheres well with *perfida* and *celat*, and the corruption involves letters easily confused in ancient capital script (L>T, T>C). In the pentameter, *semper* is pointless if it means “all year round” and misused if intended to mean “all along its course,” and *uia . . . celat . . . aquas* gives no hint of how the waters are concealed. Palmer’s ingenious *caespes* removes both difficulties; for *caespes* of a thin covering of grass cf. Pliny *NH* 17.26 *statim subest harena tenuissimo caespitum corio*. As Goold notes, “haplography would account for the error and subsequent correction: *limi*TE <CE>*spes*.”

4.8.58 *territa uicinas Teia clamat aquas*

uicinis *Barber*: ‘uicini’ . . . ‘aquam!’ *Palmer*

The straightforward meaning of the transmitted text is “Teia in terror calls out to the nearby waters.” Only special pleading can yield the sense that Camps, for example, derives from it, that Teia calls upon the neighbors to bring water (as if to put out a fire). Barber’s slight adjustment to *uicinis* might point the way (“Teia calls to the neighbors for water”), but another of Palmer’s suggestions also merits consideration: *territa ‘uicini’ Teia clamat ‘aquam!’* It is commended by Goold (1966) 61 as “apt and lively,” but more relevant is Goold’s description of the corruption as “designed and deliberate”: “it would appear that some Propertias failed to recognize or understand the direct speech, and effected a spurious noun-adjective agreement. Not this once only, but hundreds of times shall we detect the cloven hoof of this booby in the text of our poet.” The suggestion of deliberate (even diabolical) rewriting seems to me overstated. Scribes often have difficulty recognizing breaks in syntactical flow, partly because of the absence of such markers as parentheses and quotation marks; when a piece of quoted direct speech or a parenthetical exclamation has not been correctly interpreted, a scribe will naturally attempt to produce what seems to be proper syntax and agreement. One might compare 4.1.81–2 *nunc pretium fecere deos et (fallitur auro / Iuppiter) obliquae signa iterata rotas*; if Housman’s attractive *fallimus auro (Iuppiter!) . . . signa* is correct, we would have a similar case of a misunderstood

exclamation wrongly accommodated to the syntax of the surrounding words.²⁷

The condition in which Propertius' poetry has been preserved allows wide scope for conjectural emendation, and the number of recent and plausible conjectures adopted by Goold shows that the process of restoration is far from over. At the same time, the combination of an author given to challenging uses of language and a more than usually unreliable manuscript tradition places limits on what emendation can hope to achieve; indeed, in many cases the most honest editorial position will be one of aporia. But while the corruptions in Propertius' text are real and serious, little is gained by attributing them to unscrupulous copyists bent on distorting the poet's pristine lucidity. Instead I suspect that the rhetoric employed by some skeptics has stiffened resistance to emendations that in themselves are far from outlandish.

It will never attain the familiarity of *quot editores tot Propertii*, but another of Phillimore's *sententiae* merits wider recognition: "est profecto ut peccauerint in non nullis librarii; homines enim. At non beluae."²⁸

*Some Specific Problems*²⁹

(a) *The Enigma of "Book 2"*

In whatever form Propertius originally issued his poems, it seems probable that the arrangement in the archetype reflects a late antique "complete works." One may compare the situation of Catullus and Tibullus, where the transmitted corpus represents an assemblage of originally independent entities, in the latter case involving the work of several authors. It is therefore unclear what authority the manuscript divisions into books possess, although in their favor is the fact

²⁷ At Ovid *Met.* 12.545 (Nestor speaking of Hercules) one group of manuscripts reads *ille quidem maiora fide digessit*, while another gives *i. q. m. f. quoque gessit*. Heinsius convincingly suggested *i. q. m. f. (di!) gessit*, which accounts for both manuscript versions.

²⁸ Phillimore (1901) n. p.

²⁹ Several of the problems treated in this section are also discussed by James Butrica elsewhere in this volume; some of the views expressed there are highly controversial, in particular the suggestion that the transmitted text of Book 2 contains entire elegies by authors other than Propertius.

that each new book following the first is strongly marked by an initial programmatic poem or series of poems.

In fact, Book 2 is the only part of the collection whose identity as a book is in doubt. Its length—more than 1350 lines—would be extraordinary for any Augustan poetry book, and seems especially out of keeping with the self-proclaimed small-scale character of elegy. In addition, a couplet in 2.13 appears to describe Propertius' output as consisting of three small books: *sat mea sat magna est, si tres sint pompa libelli, / quos ego Persephoniae maxima dona feram* (25–26).³⁰ Desperate attempts have been made either to deny the obvious sense of *tres libelli* (e.g., the notion that *tres* denotes “a few” rather than a specific number) or to explain its appearance in the middle of Book 2 (e.g., Baehrens's suggestion that all of 2.7–13 had once been part of Book 3).³¹ Butrica reads the reference as looking forward to a three-book collection comprising Books 2–4; his hypothesis accounts for the disputed couplet, but entails difficulties of other kinds.³² Those who believe that Book 2 is a single book may need to admit that the *tres libelli* remark remains a mystery.

For many critics beginning with Lachmann, however, the reference to *tres libelli* is clear evidence that the transmitted Book 2 is a conflation of two original books, and that 2.13 stood in the latter, the third collection of Propertius' poetry to be published. Although the collapsing of two books into one could in theory have entailed the loss of an original book ending and beginning, most critics who accept Lachmann's division of Book 2 have also assumed that the original opening to Propertius' third collection is preserved, and have looked for it in the sequence 2.10–13, all of which are implicitly or explicitly programmatic.³³ (The objection that the resulting original

³⁰ I cite the text of 25 as generally constituted; differences of reading do not fundamentally affect the issue under discussion.

³¹ Baehrens (1880) xli–xlix.

³² Internal chronological indicators in Books 2–4, as well as Propertius' evolving views of himself as a poet and his reactions to contemporaries, suggest three sets of poems separated by at least a few years. Butrica seems to assume that after Book 1 Propertius published only one other collection of his poetry, which happened to fall into three books containing poems written, respectively, between about 28–25, 23–20, and 20–16 BC. If the three-book syntagma was in fact a single planned entity, one might expect poems of different periods to be scattered through it, as in Horace's *Odes* 1–3.

³³ Two linguistic features of this part of Book 2 should be noted. First, several words or motifs relating to poetry recur: *scribere/scriptum*, 10.8, 11, 1, 13,12; *canere*

Book 2 would have been too short to stand as a collection loses some of its force if one posits with Tränkle a lacuna—potentially of considerable length—between 2.3 and 2.4.)³⁴ Lachmann regarded 2.10 as the opening of a new book because of Propertius' professed intent to write in a higher strain, but that project turns out to be an ironic tease, and is withdrawn by the poem's end. More recently 2.13 has been the focus of attention.³⁵

Despite the subtlety of argument employed in support of such reconstructions, I am not yet persuaded that 2.10–13 contain the original opening to a new collection of elegies. The undoubted opening and closing poems or poem sequences of Books 1, 2, and 3 show Propertius' programmatic statements steadily expanding and becoming more explicit about his poetic aims and affiliations; no extant poem or poems in the transmitted Book 2 seems to me sufficiently expansive and explicit to be a plausible closing to a book that opens with 2.1 or to be the opening of a book that closes with 2.34.³⁶

If the transmitted Book 2 is a single book (however much damage and reordering individual poems may have sustained), its exceptional length should probably be seen as a provocative feature—Propertius stretching the limits of what a “small-scale” poet can do—and as a witty literalization of 2.1's opening words (*quaeritis undi mihi totiens scribantur amores*) and of the following references to superabundant composition (12 *inuenio causas mille poeta nouas*, 14 *longas condimus Iliadas*).³⁷

10.7–8, 19, 12.24 (and *cantare* 12.21); *mea Musa* 10.10, 12.22; *docta puella* 11.6, 13.11. The recurrences could result from the fact that these are all poems about poetry, but they may also be interpretable as connecting links. Second, forms of *agnus* appear twenty-five times in Book 2, as often as in the other three books combined, and twelve of those occurrences come in the series of poems encompassing seven to thirteen.

³⁴ Tränkle (1965) 697; see Günther (1997a) 7–8. Murgia (2000) argues that the original Book 2 was intentionally very short (ca 450 verses), working out themes introduced in 2.1.

³⁵ See Heyworth (1995b) 166–68, Günther (1997a) 9–12.

³⁶ Günther (1997a) 11–12 compares 2.11 and 2.12 with the epigrams at the end of Book 1. Heyworth regards 2.10 as the closing poem of the original Book 2, and suggests that 2.11 and 2.12 have migrated to their present position from elsewhere in Books 2 and 3. Murgia (2000) 156–67 produces a suitably grand opening for a new collection by combining 2.12 and 13, but I believe that if anything in this murky area can be considered certain, it is that 2.12 is a single, complete poem.

³⁷ 16 *maxima de nihilo nascitur historia* might seem to be another such reference, but I agree with Butrica (1997) 199–200 that 15–16 are interpolated: to his arguments add the fact that 5–14 constitute a series of coded or explicit references to poetic genres (Philetan elegy; encomium; lyric; aetiological poetry; Homeric epic), after which the mention of *historia* is irrelevant and anticlimactic.

(b) *Poem division*

We do not know how division between poems was marked in ancient editions of Propertius. It is, however, almost certain that ancient copies contained neither the system of numbering traditional in modern editions nor the titles to individual poems (“Ad Tullum,” “De Triumpho Caesaris”) found in medieval manuscripts. The best available evidence for the practice of Propertius’ time is the contemporary Gallus papyrus, in which divisions are marked only by a larger space and a marginal sign. If that or something similar was the ancient norm, it is not surprising that problems of elegiac poem division arise not only in other poor and late transmissions such as that of Catullus but also in relatively well preserved texts such as Ovid’s *Amores*.³⁸

The division of more than a third of Propertius’ elegies in the standard numeration is affected by some form of disagreement in the manuscripts, and several recent critics have concluded that the manuscript divisions should be accorded no authority whatever.³⁹ As unsettling as that sounds, in practice many of the manuscript divisions, even if nothing more than guesswork, coincide with the divisions editors would introduce based on their own analysis.

Outside Book 2, the disputed cases turn on a single question, which might be designated the “diptych” problem: should a set of lines that have a close thematic connection, but that also contain a strong internal conclusion and a new start, be regarded as a single elegy, an elegy in two distinct parts, or two elegies? The poems in question are 1.8, 3.1–2, 3.24–25, and 4.1; in only one case, that of 3.1–2, do the manuscripts mark a division. A break of some kind, however, seems called for in 1.8 before line 27, partly to reflect the shift from addressing Cynthia in the second person to speaking of her in the third, and partly because 1.8 is the counterpart of 1.11 and 12 (joined in most manuscripts but divided by editors).⁴⁰ I regard 3.1–2 and 3.24–25 as comparable cases, each dealing with a single theme but with a sharp enough internal shift of focus to justify division, and their position at the opening and close of a book sug-

³⁸ See Heyworth (1995a).

³⁹ Günther (1997a) 6; similarly Heyworth (1995b) 172, Murgia (2000) 148.

⁴⁰ Butrica (1996b).

gests that they should be treated in the same way. With 4.1, however, there is a strong argument for seeing the two main sections (1–70, 71–150) as a quasi-dramatic agon between Propertius and Horos, and therefore as a single entity. Even these relatively uncomplicated examples show that a straightforward binary model—one poem or two—may not do justice to Propertius' ways of structuring and connecting poems.

The issue becomes much more pressing in Book 2, especially from poem 13 onward. In that part of the book even the relatively conservative Barber divides ten poems—eight of them into two elegies and two into three—as well as postulating five lacunae, some of which could contain original poem divisions now lost.⁴¹ It begins to appear that either Propertius was engaging in a very peculiar form of experimentation at this point in his career, or that this part of his text was copied with exceptional negligence—or both.

A point made by Hubbard could help to explain why issues of poetic unity are especially vexed in Book 2: in that book Propertius was strongly influenced by Tibullus and attempted to emulate his discursive, more loosely structured manner, without fully integrating those characteristics with his previous style.⁴² Such a change of manner has been usefully invoked in dealing with cases like 2.28, which Barber divided into three elegies and which other critics have described as a “cycle” of related poems.⁴³ One consequence of a more “Tibullan” approach to structure is that Propertius may have used couplets with a strong closural feel to mark off units within a longer poem, rather than to end a poem. Possible examples include 2.3.43–44 and 2.13.15–16, both of which have been regarded by some editors as ending an elegy.

Unfortunately, the matter is even more complicated. If it were certain that the transmitted text of Book 2 (or of the original Books 2 and 3) was complete and essentially in the correct order, we might hope to make progress with the question of poetic unity through closer study of transitions or recurring structural devices. As it is, however, some recent critics have alleged serious dislocation and

⁴¹ Poems divided: 13A and B; 18A, B, and C; 22A and B; 24A and B; 26A and B; 28A, B, and C; 29A and B; 30A and B; 33A and B; 34A and B. Lacunae posited before 18B; within 24A, 26B, 27, 29A.

⁴² Hubbard (1975) 47–64.

⁴³ La Penna (1982) 522.

reordering of that portion of the text. The most radical hypothesis is that of Heyworth, who believes that the original order of poems has undergone massive disruption, resulting from a prearchetypal reader's efforts to repair a seriously lacunose text with the aid of a *florilegium* or miscellany of Propertian material.⁴⁴ If that is the case, attempts to restore the original order or shape of many poems in Book 2 are likely to be futile. It remains to be seen, however, whether Heyworth's thesis or its application in his OCT text will gain wider acceptance.⁴⁵

(c) *Transposition*

Transposition was first employed as a tool of Propertian textual criticism by Scaliger in his edition of 1577. In words that would echo down the centuries, he called up the figure of a careless or reckless scribe who, in addition to innumerable copying errors, was guilty of displacing whole pages and many lines in the second and third books.⁴⁶ It is very likely that Scaliger's extreme formulation has helped fuel the resistance to transposition expressed by many textual critics, including proponents of conjectural emendation.⁴⁷ Typical of such resistance is the often-cited comment of Butler and Barber: "with regard to the drastic remedy of wholesale transposition . . . it cannot be justified until some reasoned explanation is forthcoming. . . . That a couplet or a series of couplets should stray far afield . . . is incredible in default of some definite theory."⁴⁸

Several skeptics have recently offered accounts of how such transpositions could occur. Butrica has assembled a dossier of transpositions in the extant manuscripts of Propertius; many are easily explicable (such as the inversion of adjacent lines), but there are enough cases

⁴⁴ Heyworth (1995b) 168–71.

⁴⁵ Murgia (2000) 182 claims that the *florilegium* theory could explain intrusions of fragmentary units, but fails to account for the mislocation of complete poems. A similar theory was previously advanced by Damon and Helmbold (1953); for critical comment, see Shackleton Bailey (1952–1953) 11–12.

⁴⁶ "Nae ille audax aut negligens homo fuit, quisquis ille fuit. Nam praeter innumera menda . . . magni sceleris se obligavit, quum in secundo et tertio libro integras paginas et magnum numerum uersuum suo loco luxauerit"; quoted by Grafton (1983) 315 n. 80.

⁴⁷ E.g., Shackleton Bailey (1952–1953) 9–12, Kenney (1973) 55–56, 146, Willis (1972) 151–155.

⁴⁸ Butler and Barber (1933) lxix.

of complex or long-range dislocation to show that such things do not exist only in the imaginations of skeptical critics.⁴⁹ Courtney notes that if a parallel passage quoted from within the same author is mistakenly inserted into the text, it creates a doublet and thereby raises the possibility that the lines will subsequently be deleted in the wrong place. If that happens, the result will be dislocation over a great distance with no visible motive.⁵⁰ Günther has pointed to relevant phenomena in other texts, e.g., a major omission leading to incorrect insertion of the omitted text, or a scribal tendency to insert detached portions of text at the end of the nearest complete poem.⁵¹ Finally, Heyworth's theory of large-scale loss and supplementation offers nearly limitless scope for transposition, at least within that part of the text thought to have been particularly affected.

But it is one thing to show that passages can be moved from their original location, and quite another to argue persuasively that this has happened in a specific instance. Here I must acknowledge a possible antitransposition bias of my own: proposed transpositions rarely have to my mind the immediate and compelling persuasiveness of the best verbal conjectures. Persuasiveness in such matters is obviously connected to the standard of judgment that is applied. I believe that Butler and Barber set the bar too high in saying that "transpositions to be justified must do more than give a slight improvement; they must be absolutely convincing, if they are to be embodied in the text."⁵² Nevertheless, I find in the case of many proposed transpositions that the rearranged text does not seem significantly more compelling than the one it is meant to replace.

To illustrate, I will consider some cases that proponents of transposition regard as especially convincing. Courtney says of Housman's transposition of 3.9.33–34 to follow 2.1.38 "in my view no more certain correction was ever made in the text of Propertius."⁵³ I am inclined to agree with Camps that although 3.9.33–34 would fit well where Housman placed them, the couplet is needed in its transmitted position (where *uera tropaea* in 34 contrasts with the trophies Maecenas

⁴⁹ Butrica (1997) 189–96.

⁵⁰ Courtney (1987).

⁵¹ Günther (1997a) 21 and 24–28 respectively.

⁵² Butler and Barber (1933) lxx.

⁵³ Courtney (1987) 14.

has refused to acquire); the transposition would also blunt the clausal force of 2.1.38 *hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden*.

Günther calls 2.22.43–50 “the most obvious case for a dislocated fragment in the Propertian corpus” and commends Housman’s relocation of the lines to follow 2.17.4.⁵⁴ In my view 43–50 read more naturally as an independent treatment of a situation (the stood-up lover) than as an elaboration of an already stated one.

Of the relocation of 2.34.47–50 after 54 (Müller) and 77–80 after 66 (Ribbeck) Günther writes: “Both transpositions are so patently correct that nobody who does not object to such transpositions in principle can fail to adopt them.”⁵⁵ In this case I do think there are good reasons for transposing: 47–50 in their transmitted position are a clumsy parenthesis, while if *haec* in 81 refers to the *Eclogues* (as seems likely), the reference is much easier to grasp if the foregoing lines do not relate instead to the *Georgics*. It may be significant that both transpositions can be readily accounted for on the hypothesis that a block of text was omitted and then reinserted at the wrong point.⁵⁶

That tiny sampling suggests that advocates of transposition still have a good deal of persuading to do.⁵⁷

While the extent of transposition in Propertius’ text is likely to remain a point of contention, some benefit might come from examining more closely the thought processes of Propertian elegy. Transposers tend to assume that Propertius placed a high value on logical coherence, while their opponents often seem to believe that he had no regard for it whatsoever. An example of the more nuanced approach I have in mind is Hubbard’s observation that some of Propertius’ apparently abrupt transitions are the product of a rhetorical strategy that he shares with Juvenal and Lucan: “all three of them work within a rhetorical and poetic tradition that leads the reader to expect that *b* will follow *a*; all three of them exploit this fact and aim at the surprise of paradox, where the cultivated reader is expected to savour the collocation of *a* and not *b*.”⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Günther (1997a) 19–20.

⁵⁵ Günther (1997a) 32.

⁵⁶ The omission of 77–80 (or of 67–76) could have been caused by a leap of the eye from *tu canis* in 67 to the same words in 77.

⁵⁷ As is also suggested by Radicke (1999), the only serious review of Günther’s monograph known to me.

⁵⁸ Hubbard (1975) 6. Shackleton Bailey once remarked that Propertius was given to skipping steps in a sequence of thought, then continuing as if he had spelled out

(d) *Interpolation*

Interpolation has not been nearly as often invoked in the criticism of Propertius as in several other Latin poets (e.g., Ovid, Seneca, Lucan, and Juvenal), and if one were to judge its frequency by the evidence of recent editions, one would conclude that it figures in a very small number of cases. Barber brackets seven passages, Goold five, Fedeli just one (4.9.42, a doublet of 66 in the same elegy).

Reluctance to diagnose interpolation is not merely due to the conservatism of most Propertian editors. When dealing with a transmission in which it seems clear that at least some dislocation has taken place, even skeptical critics have often preferred to regard passages that do not cohere with their context not as interpolations but as Propertian verses that have strayed from their intended position. Thus, for example, Postgate's 1894 text marked nearly thirty passages comprising 82 verses as genuine but removed from their proper location, while bracketing only one couplet, 4.5.55–56, an exact duplicate of 1.2.1–2 that almost all modern critics agree is interpolated (see below).

Recently, however, both Butrica and Günther have argued that interpolation has played a larger part in the transmission than previously acknowledged.⁵⁹ Each has invoked the notion of “collaborative interpolation,” a term I coined to describe a type of emulation in which a reader—in most cases, an ancient reader—responds to the rhetoric of the text by amplifying or embellishing it.⁶⁰ Another cause of interpolation is the insertion of passages from other authors cited because of their similarity to a line or couplet of Propertius. 4.5.55–6 is a clear instance of such an intruded parallel passage, easily recognizable because the interpolated lines come from elsewhere in Propertius. Courtney cited the case of Ovid *Amores* 3.11.35–6, a couplet that is obviously out of place in its transmitted position and of which the hexameter appears on a wall in Pompeii.⁶¹

The interpolated couplet in *Amores* 3.11 illustrates one type of potential insertion, amatory *gnomai* that could easily find a place in

the intervening idea. The result would be an “A [B] C” sequence, which to a tidy-minded critic might suggest a need either for marking a lacuna or for reshuffling the couplets to produce a clearer order.

⁵⁹ Butrica (1997) 197–206, Günther (1997a) 115–132.

⁶⁰ Tarrant (1989) 137–62.

⁶¹ Courtney (1987) 9.

various elegiac contexts.⁶² Two possible examples are 2.26.27–8 *multum in amore fides, multum constantia prodest: / qui dare multa potest, multa et amare potest* (deleted or transposed by many critics, treated by Goold as part of a fragment), or 2.24.47–48 *dura est quae multis simulatum fingit amorem, / et se plus uni si qua parare potest* (placed after line 22 by Rossberg). Mythological *exempla* are another promising source of interpolations, in part because they offered erudite readers the opportunity to show off their learning, and in part because *exempla* are usually adduced in a series, and the desire to expand a series is a recurring motive in “collaborative” interpolations. A likely instance is 1.15.15–16 *Alphesiboea suos ulta est pro coniuge fratres, / sanguinis et cari uincula rupit amor*; the couplet cannot stand in its transmitted position because it disrupts the *non sic . . . nec sic* sequence of 9–14, 17–20, but the emphasis on vengeance also puts it at a tangent to the other *exempla*.

Another possible interpolation is 4.4.17–18 *et satis una malae potuit mors esse puellae, / quae uoluit flammis fallere, Vesta, tuas?* The indignant exclamation is premature in its transmitted location, before Tarpeia has even caught sight of Tatius, while in the position given it by Broekhuizen (followed by Goold), after 92, it is contradicted by the emphasis in the surrounding lines on the aptness of Tarpeia’s death (92 *officiis dos erat apta tuis*, 94 *iniustae praemia sortis habes*). I suspect that the couplet is an ancient reader’s response to Tarpeia’s story as presented by Propertius.⁶³

Reviewing Hanslik’s Teubner text, Antonio La Penna remarked that an edition of Propertius that could achieve wide agreement is perhaps an impossibility.⁶⁴ Nothing in the past twenty years has disproven La Penna’s statement, and reactions to Heyworth’s forthcoming edition will in all likelihood confirm its validity. One hopes, however, that the appearance of a radically skeptical text will chal-

⁶² Several of Postgate’s allegedly misplaced passages would fall under that description. Butrica (1997) 198 cites a thirteenth-century *florilegium* (Vatican Reg. lat. 2120) in which a gnomic couplet of medieval origin has been inserted between two consecutive lines of Propertius (2.33.33 and 34).

⁶³ Other plausible candidates for bracketing: 2.6.41–42; 2.23.23–24 (1–2 and 21–22 are closely linked by the anti-Callimachean associations of *indocti semita uulgi* in 1 and *Euphrates* in 21); 3.8.25–26, 35–36; 4.3.37–38 (Heyworth (1999) 74–75 makes a strong case for the couplet’s not belonging where transmitted; he seems to regard it as Propertian, but it is perhaps better taken as an intruded parallel); 4.8.19–20 (bracketed by Barber, placed after 2 by Goold).

⁶⁴ La Penna (1982) 523.

lenge conservative critics to reenter a discussion that has recently been dominated by the skeptics. Conservatives and skeptics may never agree on a single Propertius, but by engaging seriously with each other's arguments they can deepen our understanding of this brilliant but often enigmatic poet.

Postscript

Three noteworthy contributions to Propertian textual criticism and editing appeared in 2005, after this essay had been written: Paolo Fedeli's massive commentary on Book 2 (Cambridge: Francis Cairns), Simone Viarre's Budé text and translation (Paris: Les Belles Lettres), and Giancarlo Giardina's edition with facing Italian translation (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo). To varying degrees, all three have been influenced by the work of Goold, Butrica, and Heyworth. Fedeli accepts the division of Book 2 into two books, with 2.12 the opening of the original Book 3; he also believes that the original Book 2 has suffered large-scale losses and rearrangements. In his commentary, though, he aims to make sense of the text as transmitted, and while he has changed his views on a number of individual readings, the character of his text does not differ fundamentally from that of his Teubner edition. Viarre has been persuaded by Butrica and Heyworth to regard the X family of manuscripts as an independent branch of the tradition, and has constructed her apparatus accordingly. She has given careful consideration to Goold's Loeb text and has followed Goold in some textual choices and also in admitting a certain number of transpositions. Giardina's edition is the most radical text of Propertius to appear in several decades, and represents a complete reversal of direction when compared with his 1977 edition of Book 2. Embracing the view that Propertius' stylistic difficulty results from scribal corruption rather than authorial mannerism, Giardina has set out to restore the putative original through emendation: his text contains hundreds of his own conjectures, which are sometimes so thickly clustered as to produce a rewriting of the transmitted text. Taken together, these publications testify to the liveliness and lack of consensus that have characterized recent work in this area of Propertian studies.

PART THREE

PROPERTIUS AND THE TRADITION OF GREEK
AND ROMAN POETRY

CHAPTER FOUR

PROPERTIUS AND THE ORIGINS OF LATIN LOVE-ELEGY

Francis Cairns

Introduction

The publication in 1979 of an important set of Latin elegiacs—the Gallus fragment from Qasīr Ibrīm¹—inevitably stimulated fresh reflections on the origins of Roman elegy. These were intensified when in 1987 a fragmentary Oxyrhynchus papyrus containing Greek elegiacs (POxy 3723) was first published,² a text that revived interest in three other such fragments published earlier (1972).³ The final chapter (9) of my *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (= Cairns 1979), entitled ‘The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy’ in allusion to A. A. Day’s homonymous monograph of 1938, went to press in 1978, a year before the Qasīr Ibrīm fragment appeared, and almost a decade before the publication of POxy 3723. The new texts, and the papers which they have generated in the meantime, have firmed up some of the conclusions of Cairns (1979) Ch. 9; but they have not altered radically the ‘state of the question’, or undercut the views expressed in that chapter, which I still believe to be substantially correct. Hence, in reengaging with the problem, it seemed more sensible to begin by reprinting the relevant portion of Ch. 9 rather than by offering a paraphrase of it.⁴ The reprinted section is followed by a postscript

¹ Anderson-Parsons-Nisbet (1979).

² In *OP* 54.58–64.

³ See pp. 92–3 below.

⁴ References that were incomplete in Cairns (1979) Ch. 9 because they were completed in other chapters of that volume have been tacitly completed here, and minor modifications have been made to cope with other cross-references within Cairns (1979). Two additional footnotes are indicated by asterisks, and an addendum to one footnote by square brackets. The appropriateness of reprinting this chapter is perhaps underlined by the remarks of Fantham (2000) 183 (published 2001): “The question of its [Roman elegy’s] models or origins in Hellenistic elegy has barely advanced after a century of discussion since Jacoby, and should perhaps be discarded as a false problem.”

containing a brief survey of some of the subsequent secondary literature that either deals with the new texts and their interpretation or otherwise contributes to the question of 'The Origins'.

'The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy'

This subtitle is also that of A. A. Day's famous work. Day, in his first chapter, dealt with the most intractable problem in ancient elegy. This is that the Roman elegists write about erotic matters in the first person and claim they are writing about their own experiences—the 'subjective' Latin love-elegy—while the Hellenistic poets, whom the Roman elegists regard as their predecessors, seem, on the basis of their surviving fragments, to be doing something completely different. Their erotic elegiac passages are third-person narrations of the emotions and experiences of mythical and historical characters, that is, they are 'objective' erotic elegy. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was considerable controversy over this problem.⁵ One side believed in a lost Hellenistic and earlier Greek subjective elegy in which Greek elegists had anticipated Roman elegy and told of their own loves. The other side maintained that Hellenistic love-elegy was always third-person and objective and that the Hellenistic elegists did not write subjective love-elegy. For them the Roman elegists were making an original contribution when they wrote subjective first-person elegy; and they were influenced to do so by a wide variety of Greek literature in addition to Hellenistic elegy.

Day reviewed the progress of the controversy up to his own time in an astringent and authoritative fashion. He came down heavily in favor of the second side, claiming that the hypothesis of a Greek 'subjective' love-elegy was both unfounded and unnecessary. He showed convincingly that the Roman elegists exploited a great many sources besides Greek elegy, for example New Comedy, rhetoric and epigram, in order to combine the length and imaginative wealth of Hellenistic 'objective' elegy with the personal character of Hellenistic epigram.

Day's work, with its clear-cut distinction between 'subjective' and 'objective' and its simple verdict, has won general approval. It had

⁵ Summarized by Day (1938) 1ff.

few reviews, partly because its importance was not appreciated when it was published and partly because it appeared just before the outbreak of the Second World War. Some of the few reviews were mildly unhappy about Day's conclusions;⁶ and there have been some later protests. But there has never been a full re-examination of Day's arguments.

Characteristic of the later protests⁷ against Day's views is that of J.-P. Boucher.⁸ Boucher claimed that the whole problem was a pseudo-problem, because the distinction between 'subjective' and 'objective' was false. He argued correctly that Roman elegy is not genuinely autobiographical. The Roman elegists are assuming a *persona*, that of the elegiac lover-poet, which is a self-conscious construct, and each poet gives this construct, or rather his own version of it, his personal name. Boucher concludes that in this sense Latin love-elegy is just as 'objective' as Hellenistic love-elegy, because in each the erotic heroes are characters and not the poets themselves. This is an ingenious view and one that certainly focuses the problem more accurately, but does not in fact remove or solve it. There remains the important distinction that Hellenistic elegists wrote in the third person about mythical and historical characters, while Roman elegists write in the first person about a construct to which they attach their own name. The problem of 'subjective' and 'objective' elegy in this sense therefore remains a real one, and this chapter offers a new solution to it.

It must be made clear at the outset that this new solution will not involve denying the modern consensus about this problem. Some Latin 'subjective' love-elegy is certainly a reworking of Hellenistic 'objective' elegy.⁹ Roman elegists do imagine themselves in the emotional situations of the heroes of Hellenistic elegy and so transform 'objective' into 'subjective' elegy. But this is only part of the truth, and in isolation it offers an unsatisfactory account of the development of Roman elegy. Day dealt with each fragment of Greek elegy and *testimonium* for Greek subjective love-elegy individually and, quite naturally, found them wanting. His subsequent chapters treat other

⁶ Cf. Wilkinson (1939); Helm (1939); Prescott (1940).

⁷ E.g., Fedeli (1974); Ross (1975) 51f.

⁸ Boucher (1966) 99f.; Newman (1967) 365ff. also doubts the reality of the subjective-objective division.

⁹ Cairns (1969) 131ff. and Cairns (1979) 111-12.

sources of inspiration for subjective Latin love-elegy, all correct and important. But his book is to some extent motivated by a desire to claim for Roman elegy originality and independence of Greek sources. However, there is overwhelming evidence that all Augustan literature is indebted to Greek literature and that the Augustans knew this and believed it both inevitable and right. Horace, for example, did not try to claim that *satura quidem tota nostra est* but attempted to point to Greek origins. Day then begins with the wrong presupposition and advances his position by brilliant advocacy. But his views do create serious literary-historical difficulties that are worth summarizing before the evidence is re-examined.

First, Day's solution relied on a sharp distinction between subjective erotic elegy and other types of 'subjective' elegy, for which there is no ancient evidence. On the contrary, the Roman elegists treat erotic themes subjectively in addition to and in combination with political, social, literary, symposiastic, moral, and other themes. Second, both sides in the controversy admitted that 'subjective' erotic epigrams in the elegiac metre were commonly written in the Hellenistic period. These are distinguished from elegies only by their length. Length was an important concept in Hellenistic poetry but there is no evidence that literary theory required writers composing elegiac poems of over ten or twelve lines to avoid subjective erotic content. Third, some of Theocritus' longer erotic poems in other meters make the distinction look frail, namely *Idylls* 2, 3, 12, 29 and 30 (cf. also Ps.-Theocritus 20 and 23). It is true that the speaker in these idylls is certainly or probably not Theocritus, but rather Simaetha (2), an unnamed goatherd (3), and unnamed lovers (12, 29, 30). But in the latter cases the gap between the *persona* of the speaker and the *personae* that Roman elegiac poets adopt is slight; and it is hard to see why we should believe that Theocritus could write in this way in other meters while no Hellenistic poet could use elegy for subjective erotic purposes. Fourth, it is difficult to understand why two of the Roman elegists constantly claim to be inspired by Mimnermus, Philetas, and Callimachus if all the love-elegies of these Greek poets were narrative and if they never at any point wrote anything more like Roman love-elegy.¹⁰ Fifth, in the absence of a Greek subjective erotic elegy, Catullus' elegiac poems, and in particular 68, have no

¹⁰ This point troubled some of Day's (1938) reviewers. See n. 6 above.

literary context, no precedent and no place in the development of the form. Finally, if we deny that there was any Greek subjective love-elegy, then a suspiciously large part in the development of Latin love-elegy must be credited to Cornelius Gallus, of whose work almost nothing survives and about whom there is little reliable information.¹¹

These difficulties more than justify a fresh look at the evidence. Most of the surviving fragments of early Greek elegy treat military, political, social or moral themes and are attributed to Mimnermus, Callinus, Solon, Tyrtaeus, and Theognis. Early Greek elegy often exhorts to bravery, propounds a view of the state or of the current condition of the city, urges political action, or inculcates social *mores* and personal morality. The fragments are almost all subjective, some are erotic, and certain individual elegies—especially those of Solon—are long. A few of the erotic pieces are by Mimnermus, while the majority are part of the Theognidean corpus.¹² Both are important for the question under discussion. Mimnermus was regarded as the originator of Greek subjective erotic elegy by those scholars who believed in its existence, an assessment founded primarily on four pieces of evidence: first, Mimnermus Fr. 1(D); second, the fact that Mimnermus wrote an elegiac work named, after his mistress, *Nanno*; thirdly six lines of the Hellenistic poet Hermesianax, which are part of his account of the loves of poets in his elegiac poem, the *Leontion*:

Μίμνερμος δέ, τὸν ἡδὺν ὅς εὔρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλάς 35
 ἦχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεύμα τὸ πενταμέτρου,
 καίετο μὲν Ναννοῦς, πολὺ δ' ἐπὶ πολλάκι λωτῷ
 κημωθεὶς κόμους εἶχε σὺν Ἑξαμύῃ,
 ἦχθεε δ' Ἑρμόβιον τὸν αἰεὶ βαρὺν ἡδὲ Φερεκλῆν
 ἐχθρόν, μισήσας οἱ ἀνέπεμψεν ἔπη. (Fr. 7.35–40 Powell)

‘And Mimnermus who, after much endurance, invented the sweet sound and breath of the soft pentameter, fell in love with Nanno and afterwards, with the grey lotus-pipe bound to his lips, went on revels with Examues. He hated Hermobios who was always loathsome to him and Pherekles, his enemy, and in hating them what verse he used in his reply!’

and fourth, a Propertian reference to Mimnermus: *plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero* (The verse of Mimnermus is more powerful in love than Homer) (Propertius 1.9.11).

¹¹ Written before the appearance of Anderson-Parsons-Nisbet (1979).

¹² Cf. the excellent discussion of this material in West (1974) 5ff.; 40ff. For Mimnermus cf. also Szádeczky-Kardoss (1959); and *RE* Suppl. 11 s.v.

Day was skeptical about the evidence for subjective elegy by Mimnermus (3ff.),¹³ but the passage of Hermesianax in particular cannot be brushed aside as Day has done. It is undeniable that Hermesianax believed Mimnermus had loved a girl called Nanno, and had written verses against his enemies Hermobios and Pherecles. A further conclusion about Hermesianax's views can be drawn from the symmetry of thought between lines 37f. on one hand and lines 39f. on the other. In lines 39f. he refers to Mimnermus' written works attacking Hermobios and Pherecles; in 37f. he speaks of his love for Nanno and his komoi with Examues. Now there is a standard ancient poetic convention whereby a poet can be said to do something that he writes about.¹⁴ Hence it is certain that lines 37f. also refer to Mimnermus' work: Hermesianax believed that Mimnermus wrote poetry about his love for Nanno and about going on erotic komoi with Examues, just as he composed attacks on his enemies.

Now it might be objected that Hermesianax is an unreliable witness. But two considerations must be borne in mind. First, from our point of view, the beliefs of a Hellenistic writer about archaic Greek elegy are in many ways just as useful as facts. Even if they are invalid about archaic Greek poetry, they can tell us something about Hellenistic poetry. If Hermesianax believed that Mimnermus had written subjectively in his *Nanno*, it is all the more likely that Hermesianax himself did so in his *Leontion*. Second, although the value of Hermesianax's information about the loves of poets is admittedly variable—no one, for example, would take seriously what Hermesianax says about Homer having been in love with Penelope¹⁵—there is reason to take him seriously here. He was from Colophon, a town that claimed Mimnermus too as a citizen.¹⁶ This makes it probable that Hermesianax was personally acquainted with Mimnermus' poetry and derived his 'facts' about Mimnermus from it. Another possible alternative or joint source for Hermesianax's knowledge of Mimnermus is worth

¹³ It is interesting to contrast with Day's skepticism the statement of M. L. West (1974) 12, unbiased by preconceptions about Roman elegy: 'Mimnermus is represented by Hermesianax . . . as playing the pipes on many a κῶμος with Examyes, which presumably had some basis in his poems.'

¹⁴ Cf. Thuc. 1.5.2; Virg. *Ecl.* 6.46; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.36f.; 2.5.41; Prop. 2.30.19ff.; 3.3.39ff.; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.77f.

¹⁵ Fr. 7.27ff. Powell.

¹⁶ Cf. *R-E* Suppl. 11.939. M. was a Smyrniote; but his ancestors came originally from Colophon, and he himself lived there at the end of his life.

mentioning. Mimnermus was a highly revered figure in Ionia. There was in the Roman period a gymnasium called the Mimnermeion at Smyrna, Mimnermus' place of birth.¹⁷ Such cult centers were common in the late Classical and Hellenistic periods¹⁸ and there would almost certainly have been one at Colophon in the Hellenistic period. A Mimnermeion would have contained works of the poet and a commemorative inscription. The inscriptional remains from the site of a parallel Hellenistic cult of an ancient poet, the Archilocheion at Paros,¹⁹ give a clue about what the inscription might have been like; and Hermesianax would have known it. For various reasons then it is probable that Hermesianax was writing with more than his usual authority when he relates Mimnermus' love for Nanno and komoi with Examues, and hence that Mimnermus did write at least some subjective erotic elegy.

The Theognidean corpus confirms that archaic Greek elegy could easily handle erotic themes subjectively and at some length.²⁰ It is printed in modern editions as a series of short isolated poems, most of epigrammatic length, but M. L. West²¹ presents a different view of its original form. He states that some of the pieces can be recognized as excerpts from what were originally longer poems and concludes: "it is *a priori* very credible that Theognis composed extended elegies in the style of Mimnermus, Solon, Xenophanes, and others" (40). West notes a fairly long fragment, 237–54, as an example of Theognis' capacity for extended writing and describes even it as 'hardly a complete poem' (41). If West is right and the corpus originally contained longer poems—or even if the present extracts were written down as if linked—then here was archaic subjective elegy that included erotic elegy in the love-poems addressed to the boy Cynrus. If this form of the corpus survived to the Hellenistic period, then it could have stimulated Hellenistic subjective erotic elegy. The close association between erotic, political, and moral themes in the corpus is worth stressing because the same combination of themes recurs in Roman subjective love-elegy.

¹⁷ Cf. Szádeczky-Kardoss (1959) 17 No. 31.

¹⁸ Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1398B; Diog. Laert. 1.88; Fraser (1972) I.313 and II Ch. 6 nn. 56f. and the works cited by him; Kontoleon (1952 [1954]) 50f.; Treu (1959) 207, and see n. 17 above.

¹⁹ Cf. Kontoleon (1952 [1954]) 50f. and (1956) 29ff.; Treu (1959) 40ff.; 205ff.

²⁰ Wilkinson (1939) 273f.

²¹ West (1974).

To sum up: archaic Greek elegy is almost entirely subjective, it contains pieces of some length, and sometimes treats erotic subjects in combination with other themes. Theognis certainly did write subjective elegiac poetry about his love for the boy Cyrnus, and Mimnermus probably wrote it about his love for the Lydian flute-girl Nanno. When we move on to the Hellenistic period it is no surprise to find that the first candidate as a writer of subjective love-elegy is another Colophonian, Antimachus, who worked around 400 BC. On the testimony of Hermesianax and Plutarch²² Antimachus composed a work, the *Lyde*, called after his wife, to console himself for her death. In this book he recounted the griefs of the heroes, presumably their erotic losses. Writing about Antimachus' *Lyde*, Day makes a concession that he quickly shrugs off but which not only undercuts his position but is the key to the new view I shall offer. He writes: 'Part of the elegy, however, probably the introduction, may have been concerned with the poet's grief, real or imagined . . .' (11). This concession had already been made by H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber when they briefly laid down in the introduction to their commentary on Propertius the position later amplified by Day. Speaking of Antimachus' *Lyde* they remark:²³ 'There is no evidence that the personal element extended beyond the frame of the poem.' It is indeed entirely probable that the function of the *Lyde* was revealed within the poem and was not merely known from external evidence; and a prologue or epilogue would be the natural place for such a revelation. As well as detailing his grief, Antimachus must also have rehearsed his love for his wife. This emerges from Ovid, *Tristia* 1.6.1: *nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae* and from six more lines of Hermesianax, also from the *Leontion* 'loves of the poets' passage:

Λυδῆς δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος
 πληγείς Πακτωλοῦ ρεῦμ' ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ·
 †δαρδανη δὲ θανοῦσαν ὑπὸ ξηρὴν θέτο γαῖαν
 κλαίων, αἰζαον† δ' ἦλθεν ἀποπρολιπὼν
 ἄκρην ἐς Κολοφῶνα, γῶν δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους
 ἱράς, ἐκ παντὸς παυσάμενος καμάτου. (Fr. 7.41–6 Powell)

'And Antimachus, struck by love of Lydian Lyde, went to the stream of the river Paktolos . . . and when she died he buried her beneath the dry earth weeping, and leaving . . . he went to high Colophon and filled his sacred books with lamentations and so escaped from all his toil.'

²² Day (1938) 10.

²³ Butler and Barber (1933) intr. liii.

When the opponents of Greek subjective elegy have conceded this point, it is perhaps unnecessary to argue it further. Certainly the onus of proof would lie with anyone who wanted to deny that there was at least a subjective frame to the *Lyde*; and if Antimachus wrote a subjective prologue or epilogue about his love and loss, it is even more likely that in a similar passage or passages of his *Nanno*, Mimnermus had done the same. Again, if at the very beginning of the Hellenistic period such a piece of subjective erotic elegy was possible, is there any reason to doubt that Philetas wrote at least one elegiac poem in which narrative material was preceded or followed or linked by a subjective erotic passage? In this way the *testimonium* of Hermesianax about Philetas becomes more comprehensible:

Οἶσθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοιδόν, ὃν Εὐρυπύλου πολιῆται
 Κῶοι χάλκειον στήσαν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ
 Βιττίδα μολπάζοντα θοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν
 ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλίην. (Fr. 7.75–8 Powell)

‘And you know the poet whom the Coan citizens of Eurypylus set up in bronze beneath the plane tree, singing of his volatile Bittis, Philetas worn out with his research on every word and every dialect.’

These lines refer to an actual statue on Cos—no doubt erected by the citizens in connection with a cult of Philetas of the type discussed above (88). It would seem ultranegative to insist that all Philetas’ works about his love for Bittis were short epigrams if a hundred years before Antimachus has written a subjective elegiac passage in his *Lyde*. If the character Philetas in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* reflects the poet Philetas, as I suggested in Cairns (1979) 25–27, then the reconstructed picture of Philetas’ poetry can be filled out with further details.

What of Hermesianax himself, another Hellenistic poet? His *Leontion*, again named after his mistress, consisted mainly of love-stories. Again there seems little point in Hermesianax writing such a work if no portion of it explained for whom and why the book was so named and constituted, particularly if the book’s predecessors had already done similar things or even if Hermesianax merely thought they had. In addition, the very nature of Hermesianax’s long catalogue, to which Propertius 2.34 and Ovid, *Tristia* 2 might be compared, suggests that Hermesianax was justifying through parallels his own combination of personal erotic poetry and myth. Of the *Apollō* of Alexander Aetolus, made up of stories of tragic love-affairs between men and

women, and of the Ἑρῶτες ἢ καλοὶ of Phanocles, a catalogue of the loves of heroes for beautiful boys, no specific information is available but the same general considerations apply.

The argument so far is this: once it is realized that some archaic Greek subjective love-elegy still survives and that more was written, then the *a priori* case against Hellenistic subjective love-elegy collapses. The two sides of the controversy can then be reconciled: the concession made by the skeptics about subjective frames can be accepted and amplified. Frames can involve not only prologue and epilogue sections but also link-passages; and together these can add up to a fair proportion of a work. It is these parts of objective Hellenistic elegies that constitute Hellenistic love-elegy. This means that there is no need to hypothesize discrete Hellenistic subjective elegies of the Roman type; or to assume that there was a large amount of Greek subjective erotic elegy.

It may be objected that frames, prologues, epilogues and link-passages are a somewhat vague answer to the question about Hellenistic subjective love-elegy, particularly when none of the ones hypothesized survive. In order to understand the nature of these passages it may be worth considering the most famous and best-represented Hellenistic poetry book, Callimachus' *Aetia*. This work is not named after a woman, nor are its link-passages, etc. erotic; but it does consist of narratives linked by subjective passages and some of the narratives are erotic. The subjective portions of the *Aetia* are highly informative. In the prologue to the *Aetia*—Fr. 1 (Pf.)—Callimachus gives an account of a literary controversy in which he or, to avoid the biographical fallacy, the *persona* 'Callimachus' is taking part. This account includes criticisms made of Callimachus by others and his rebuttal of them (1–8, 17–20, 31f.). Callimachus states his own literary preferences in his predecessors' work (9–16). He also relates how at the beginning of his poetic career he was instructed by Apollo what to write (21–28) and how he obeyed the god (29f.). In addition Callimachus says that he is now old and suffering from the weight of his years (33ff.). Secondary sources reveal that in the fragmentary *Dream*, Fr. 2 (Pf.), Callimachus described a Heliconian dream vision in which he met the Muses, just as Hesiod did in the *Theogony*. At one point, Fr. 7.13f. (Pf.), Callimachus requests the Muses to grant immortality to his elegies. The epilogue, Fr. 112 (Pf.), is fairly obscure; but it ends with a statement that Callimachus' next work will be his *Iambi* (9). All this material is subjective: Callimachus makes

first-person statements about his literary experiences, feelings, intentions and preferences. In this respect the *Aetia* are exactly parallel to the Roman programmatic elegies influenced by them, e.g., Propertius 2.1, 2.30A and B, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, Ovid *Amores* 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1, all of which are subjective literary elegies.

In another portion of the *Aetia*, the location of which cannot be determined, Callimachus appears in his own 'person' in a different but equally interesting context: in Fr. 178 (Pf.) he relates how at a celebration of a feast he found himself sharing a dining-couch with Theugenes of Icus. Callimachus noticed that his dining companion shared his own preference for moderate drinking. He then quoted a proverb about the pleasure of conversation over wine and went on to ask Theugenes questions about his native customs, to which the Ician replied. The whole scene is subjective and ostensibly autobiographical, and as well as being redolent of old Greek elegy, the symposiastic setting is reminiscent of the *convivium* that symbolizes and is the background to Roman erotic elegy. Again the sententiousness of the discussion of wine and conversation both recalls the tone of earlier elegy and hints at Callimachus' adoption of a didactic role analogous to that of the Roman elegiac poets' role of teacher of love. Finally there are five fragments of the *Aetia* in which Callimachus is asking questions of the Muses: Frs. 3; 7.19ff.; 76; 79; 86 (Pf.), and one long passage in which the Muses and Callimachus conduct a dialogue: Fr. 43.46ff. (Pf.). The frequent appearance of the narrator as a linking device in this long narrative work and the framing of the objective *Aetia* within a 'subjective' prologue and epilogue suggests a pattern for reconstructing the books of erotic elegy discussed above.

Within the present context the *Aetia* is interesting in another way too. It reveals how Hellenistic narrative elegy is related not only to archaic narrative elegy but also to early Greek hexameter poetry. The appearance of the narrator himself at certain points in a narrative poem is of course as old as Homer.²⁴ But the real link between archaic hexameter works and Hellenistic elegy is Hesiod's *Theogony*, which is clearly designated as the *Aetia*'s model in its prologue, Fr. 2 (Pf.) and again in its epilogue, Fr. 112.5f. (Pf.). Callimachus chose the *Theogony* as a model for the *Aetia* for several reasons. One was

²⁴ Cf. e.g., *Il.* 1.1ff.; 2.484ff.; 11.218ff.; 14.508ff.; 16.112ff.; *Od.* 1.1ff.

clearly that the *Theogony* is both erotic and aetiological, consisting as it does of learned genealogies. Another was that he wished to revive the scene of Heliconian inspiration from the beginning of the *Theogony* (22ff.). A third must have been the fact that imitation of the *Theogony* gave him access to the whole field of Hesiodic catalogue poetry. This is hinted at in the *Aetia* epilogue, which, as was noted above, first makes a final bow to Hesiod and then closes with a terminal formula which at first seems to resemble that of many Homeric Hymns. However the Callimachean example is a real programmatic formula instead of a conventional one, as such formulae became or were considered in the Homeric Hymns:²⁵

χαῖρε, σὸν εὖεστοῖ δ' ἔρχεο λωϊτέρη.
χαῖρε, Ζεῦ, μέγα καὶ σύ, σάω δ' [όλο]ν οἶκον ἀνάκτων·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν. (Callimachus Fr. 112.7ff: Pf.)

'Farewell, and return with better fortune. Farewell to you also Zeus, preserve the whole house of the kings. But I am off to the Muses' prose pasture.'

In addition, there seems little reason for Callimachus to allude at the end of the *Aetia* to the end of a Homeric Hymn, particularly since he ended none of his own hymns in this way. It may well be that Callimachus is alluding here not to Homer but again to Hesiod's *Theogony*. The *Theogony* in modern texts ends with

αἰῶται μὲν θνητοῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνηθεῖσαι
ἀθάναται γείναντο θεοῖς ἐπιείκελα τέκνα. (1019f.)

'These are the goddesses who slept with mortal men and as immortals brought forth godlike children.'

But in at least some ancient texts the first two lines of the *Catalogue of Women*, a long catalogue of heroines who loved gods or men, were tacked on to the *Theogony*:²⁶

νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν φύλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυέπειαι
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κόυραι Διὸς αἰγίοχοιο.

'But now, sweet-voiced Olympian Muses, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, sing of the tribe of women.'

²⁵ Cf. Richardson on *Hymn to Demeter* 495.

²⁶ This is a complex problem. For a full discussion, see West (1966) 48ff., 397ff., 437.

It may be that Callimachus knew such a text and modeled the end of the *Aetia* on it, ending as he did with an anticipation of his next work. It was of course the *Catalogue* that provided the pattern for Hermesianax, Alexander Aetolus, and Phanocles.

There are then two main strands of influence on Hellenistic subjective love-elegy: the subjective but non-erotic frames of Hesiodic erotic catalogue poetry written in hexameters, which must have been the predecessors of Mimnermus' subjective erotic frame for his erotic narrative in elegiacs; and the Mimnerman, Theognidean and doubtless more widespread subjective erotic elegy with a strong symboeletic bias. Originally this paraenetic aspect of elegy may have been prominent only in homosexual love-elegy, although it is not impossible that Mimnermus exploited it in heterosexual circumstances. Antimachus of Colophon appears to have combined Mimnerman form and Theognidean function—in his case specifically for self-consolation. Other writers doubtless followed suit, extending the paraenetic use of elegy fully to heterosexual as well as to homosexual poetry.

The importance of the subjective erotic frames of Hellenistic narrative elegies lies in their relationship with the narrative content. It is clear that the Greek elegists were emphasizing analogies between themselves and their heroes, and in doing so they created or implied poetic *personae* for themselves. It was this that encouraged the Roman elegists to go one stage further, to identify rather than analogize and to expand the process of subjectivization by adding to their own erotic *personae* all the emotions and experiences of the love-sick heroes of Greek narrative erotic elegy.

The advantage of seeing Roman elegy not as a completely new departure but as a logical expansion and development of Greek subjective elegy is that the contribution of each Roman poet can be seen more clearly. The 'canon' of Roman elegiac poets set down first by Ovid and confirmed by Quintilian contains four names: Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid himself. In spite of moribund controversies over the mutual influence of Tibullus and Propertius,²⁷ the canon can be regarded as chronologically accurate. But it is not, and was never intended to be, a complete list of Romans who had

²⁷ Esp. Jacoby (1909–1910) and Reitzenstein (1912) 60ff. (much more sensible on the general relationship between the two poets).

written elegy, but only of those who had written a great deal of elegy or written it exclusively. The first extant Roman elegies are Catullus 65, 66, 67, and 68. Poem 65 is a subjective elegy that forms an introduction to 66, an objective elegy translating a poem of Callimachus. It functions exactly like the hypothesised prologues of Greek narrative elegies. Although it is not erotic, it refers to Catullus' own loss of his brother and says that the translation of Callimachus is being offered to Ortalus in spite of Catullus' grief at his loss. Poem 67 employs komastic themes and deals with clandestine love, but 68 is the most interesting from the viewpoint of subjective love-elegy. In the prologue we are told that Allius has lost his mistress to a rival and is seeking consolation from Catullus, while Catullus himself has lost his brother through death and is also grief-stricken. In the body of the elegy Catullus consoles Allius, and incidentally himself, by writing a poem that includes much mythological material but is throughout a subjective erotic elegy. The myth concerns the tragic love of Protesilaus and Laodamia, cut short by death, and in this way Allius and Catullus are both consoled in their respective losses.

Catullus 68 thus contains the basic ingredients of Antimachus' *Lyde*: loss of a loved one, in Allius' case to another and in Catullus' case to death, and consolation of the grieving parties through the telling of a tragic love-story. Catullus 68 thus looks back to yet another function of the elegiac meter which probably influenced Antimachus to use it instead of the hexameter for his *Lyde*—its association with death, mourning, and consolation. What is clearly new in Catullus 68 as opposed to the hypothesised Hellenistic Greek subjective erotic elegy is that from a structural point of view it subordinates myth to reality. In Hellenistic Greek elegy the erotic material must have been structurally subordinate to the narrative elements. But in Catullus 68 the Laodamia myth illustrates subjective erotic material that revolves around it but has primacy of place. The twin griefs and consolations of the speaker and addressee dominate the thematic pattern and meet in the mythical centerpieces. The characteristics of Catullus 68 can be appreciated more accurately once it is seen as the first Roman refinement upon a Greek subjective erotic elegy. The careful structural symmetry, the heavy trappings of simile, and the learning and ornate language are appropriate to its forebears, while the bold *macrologia* of subjective erotic themes, the novel abbreviated and subordinated treatment of myth, and the

striking juxtaposition of erotic and familial love²⁸ are Catullus' own contributions.

It is not absolutely certain of course that Catullus was the first Roman elegiac poet to write subjective love-elegy. Varro Atacinus, born in 82 BC, who wrote among other works an elegiac poem entitled *Leucadia* after his mistress, is another possible candidate: Ovid's description of his work suggests that it too was a work with subjective erotic elements, perhaps of the Greek 'frame' type:

is quoque, Phasiacas Argon qui duxit in undas,
non potuit Veneris furta tacere suae. (Ovid, *Tristia* 2.439f.)

'He too, who captained the Argo into the waves of Phasis, could not keep silent about his stolen love.'

But this question is not particularly important and, from a literary-historical viewpoint it is perhaps more worthwhile to stress the role of Parthenius of Nicaea in influencing his younger contemporary Gallus, the first of the Roman canon, and perhaps Propertius too. Parthenius wrote an *Epikedion* for his dead wife Arete and an *Encomium of Arete* in three books. The latter work, and possibly the former also, contained myth, otherwise it could hardly have filled three books. Parthenius was regarded by later critics as a Hellenistic poet in direct line of descent from Callimachus and Philetas, and this work must have resembled the hypothesized Hellenistic elegies with subjective frame and narrative content. Parthenius was Virgil's teacher and was also closely linked with Cornelius Gallus. He dedicated to Gallus a collection of synopses of tragic love stories (*Erotika Pathemata*) that had been treated by Hellenistic poets:

Μάλιστα σοὶ δοκῶν ἀρμόττειν, Κορνήλιε Γάλλε, τὴν ἄθροισιν τῶν ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων ἀναλεξάμενος ὥς ὅτι πλεῖστα ἐν βραχυτάτοις ἀπέσταλκα. τὰ γὰρ παρὰ τισι τῶν ποιητῶν κείμενα τούτων, μὴ αὐτοτελῶς λελεγμένα, κατανοήσεις ἐκ τῶνδε τὰ πλεῖστα· αὐτῷ τέ σοι παρέσται εἰς ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείας ἀνάγειν τὰ μάλιστα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀρμόδια. (*Erotika Pathemata* ad init.)

'I thought, Cornelius Gallus, that this collection of unhappy love stories would be particularly suitable for you and that is why I collected them and set them out as briefly as possible. The collection will inform you of most aspects of those of them that are narrated in certain of the poets in an allusive and fragmentary form; and it will be possible for you to introduce into your hexameter and elegiac poetry those of them that are most in keeping with it.'

²⁸ See Macleod (1974) and cf. Cat. 72.3f. and Kroll *ad loc.*

There is no need to take this dedication literally and think that Gallus actually used this handbook's synopses when composing his own poetry. It seems very likely that Gallus knew the Hellenistic originals and that Parthenius is simply commending his own handbook, and Gallus and Gallus' work, to the general public, by declaring it to have been written 'by appointment to Cornelius Gallus'. But the influence of Parthenius upon Gallus must have been strong. Gallus wrote four elegiac books, of which one line has survived and which may have borne the title *Amores*.²⁹ Under the old view of Roman subjective elegy he had to be credited with most of the development of Roman elegy. Under the view now proposed he need not be credited with the invention of subjective love-elegy, which the Greeks already wrote. It goes without saying that he was not the first to subordinate mythical to subjective elements, since this is already found in Catullus 68. What he did contribute is less easy to say. The history of elegy would suggest that his work contained mythical narrative, and this is confirmed to some extent by the dedication to him of the *Erotika Pathemata*. That Gallus' elegies also contained subjective erotic elements is implied by the probable echoes of Gallan elegy in Virgil's tenth *Eclogue*.³⁰ The pastoral setting in which Gallus is placed there need not reflect Gallus' poetry. It may be no more than the means by which Virgil adapts the *persona* of Gallus to his own bucolic poetry. But at lines 22f. there is a reference to Lycoris leaving Gallus to go off with her soldier and to Gallus' sorrow at being deserted. These lines may allude to a *propemptikon* of Gallus to Lycoris, which is known to have existed, and which two Propertian *propemptika*, 1.8 and 2.19, imitate, and this *propemptikon* is certainly referred to later in *Eclogue* 10 (47–49). Another theme in which Gallus may have anticipated a subsequent Roman elegy—Tibullus 1.10—is found in lines 44f.: the love-poet is perforce a soldier. The material attested by Servius as Gallan begins at line 46 (cf. Propertius 1.8.6ff.). More description of Lycoris' journeyings (47–49) is succeeded by Gallus' retreat to mope in the wild countryside singing and cutting his love's, that is, Lycoris' name, into the trees (50–54).

²⁹ For discussion of this question cf. Boucher (1966) 72f.

³⁰ I leave *Ecl.* 6 out of consideration. For the extensive literature on echoes of Gallus in the *Eclogues*, see Boucher (1966) 84ff.; and Ross (1975) Chs. 3, 5. [The subjective nature of Gallan elegy has now been confirmed by the Qasr Ibrim fragment.]

The carving on bark notion, derived from Callimachus' *Acontius and Cydippe*, *Aetia* Fr. 73 (Pf.), recurs in Propertius 1.18.22. Next follows a hunting scene: Gallus becomes the huntsman in an attempt to soften the pangs of his love (55–61)—a notion found again in Propertius 2.19.17ff. Finally Gallus becomes an Orpheus figure wandering the world in a futile flight from love (62–69)—cf. Propertius 2.30.1ff.

Since these incidents derive from Gallus' love-poetry, it may be concluded that there was a good deal of subjective love-elegy in the poetry of Cornelius Gallus—more, it would seem, than in Hellenistic erotic elegy. Historical considerations confirm this view: that Gallus merely copied Greek elegy would appear unlikely in the light of Catullus' prior composition of at least one long subjective elegy of a more highly developed type. The very sophisticated and almost wholly subjective love-elegies of Tibullus Book 1 also imply that Tibullus is building on the work of a predecessor—Gallus—who had gone far beyond the Greek achievement. Gallus' work need not of course have been homogeneous. His four books could well have contained several different sorts of elegies.

Three further possibilities about Gallus have more plausibility than many suggestions made about him. The first is that he may have been the first among those working in the Hellenistic elegiac tradition to regard as nonessential the strong association between love and death that Antimachus' *Lyde* had established. He may have developed the hints given by Catullus in this direction and concentrated on separation from a living mistress instead of from a dead one. The second is that he was the first elegiac writer (again following Catullus' lead?) to place 'himself' fully in the situation of a mythical character. The coincidences between Callimachus' *Acontius*, the Propertius of 1.18, and Gallus as seen in *Eclogue* 10 are strong indications that Gallus, like Propertius, played an *Acontius* role in one of his elegies. Third, Gallus may well have been the first elegiac poet to write books made up of separate elegies. Hellenistic elegy books had to be united poems because there was no precedent for works made up of unlinked narratives.³¹ The subjective portions held

³¹ However, there appears to be at least one counter-example. Callimachus *Aetia* Books 3 and 4 (as opposed to Books 1 and 2) seemingly consisted of unlinked discrete elegies, and so must be added to the influences surveyed below: cf. Cameron (1995) 107–9, commenting too on the impact of the different structures on Ovid's *Fasti* and Propertius Book 4.

them together, and, in fact, the subjective portions could only be introduced in this role. Once Catullus had shown how myth could be subordinated within a long subjective elegy, the need for an elegy book to be a single united poem had passed. Each small subjective elegy could introduce itself; and the collection could consist of elegies either mainly subjective or mainly objective set side by side without connecting passages. The Theognidean corpus may again at this point have exercised some influence; and there is the further possibility that Catullus 65 and the poems following it, although not necessarily originally written to be issued as a collection of elegies plus elegiac epigrams, were published in this form; and that this suggested to Gallus the idea of writing a collection of discrete elegies composed as such. The Theocritean collection that later inspired Virgil to write the *Eclogues* may have helped Gallus too. As was noted above, some nonelegiac Theocritean idylls are very close to being subjective erotic elegiac poems in everything but meter.

Tibullus and Propertius doubtless began writing in that order; but for some purposes they can better be understood if they are thought of as making independent contributions to the form as Gallus left it. Tibullus carried much further than Catullus the subordination of myth to subjective material. This implies, as was noted above, that Gallus had already made advances upon Catullus' innovation. Propertius is initially in some ways a more old-fashioned writer than Tibullus. His first book contains more mythological material than Tibullus Book 1, and the myth is less clearly subordinated to the subjective material. The prologue poem of the *Monobiblos* is Catullan in this respect and 1.20 is completely Greek³² in its treatment of myth, which dominates the whole elegy. Indeed, the role of myth in the *Monobiblos* might suggest that, when Propertius was writing it, the primary Roman influence on him was Gallus, a view strengthened by the well-known allusions to Gallus' work in 1.8 and 1.18 and the dedication of 1.20 to Gallus himself.³³ The various poems

³² Cf. esp. Theocr. *Id.* 11; 13, for the technique used in Prop. 1.20 to link a myth with the addressee of the poem.

³³ The name Gallus occurs at Prop. 1.5.31; 10.5; 13.2, 4, 16; 20.1, 14, 51; 21.7; 4.1.95. The Galli of 1.21.7 and 4.1.95 are certainly not the poet C. Cornelius Gallus, and the identity of the Galli of 1.5, 1.10 and 1.13 is doubtful. But it is likely that the Gallus of 1.20 is the poet. Cf. Ross (1975) 74ff. [I now believe that Prop. 1.5, 1.10, and 1.13 are also addressed to C. Cornelius Gallus: cf. Cairns (1983).]

of Tibullus Book 1 doubtless became known to Propertius at different stages in the composition of the *Monobiblos*, first by recitation and perhaps finally by publication. As he came to know them, Propertius seems to have been influenced by them,³⁴ but the *Monobiblos* was not able to take full account of Tibullus Book 1. As time went on Propertius developed away from Gallus, although he retained an interest in him, and came more under the influence of Tibullus, with the result that his elegies became less mythocentric. This view explains why some of the poems of the *Monobiblos* seem much more primitive than any in Tibullus Book 1, while others show a truly individual style, as different from Tibullus as from any Gallan model that can be hypothesized.

Postscript

This postscript falls under two headings: 1) treats the 'new Gallus', its import for Propertius, and those papers published after the *editio princeps* of the new Gallus that have attempted major expansion or underpinning of the links between Gallus and Propertius; 2) focuses on post-1979 discussions of the problem of the 'Origins of Latin Love-Elegy', including prominently those taking account of the papyri published in 1972 and 1987, which seem to contain subjective Greek elegies. It concludes with a brief mention of some intervening secondary literature that has developed approaches to the 'Origins' problem consonant with those of Cairns (1979) Ch. 9.

1) *The 'new Gallus'*

The Qasr Ibrîm Gallus fragment (now fr. 2 Courtney), which, as I noted above, was unknown to me when Cairns (1979) went to press in late 1978, provided the first major independent confirmation of some of the conclusions of Cairns (1979) Ch. 9. The *editio princeps*—Anderson-Parsons-Nisbet (1979)—*inter alia* spelled out the implications of the fragment for the internal history of Latin elegy, underlined its subjective element, and provided pointers to many of the fragment's connections with Propertius and the other Roman elegists. In

³⁴ Many of the parallel passages are discussed by Jacoby (1909) 601ff.; (1910) 22ff.

brief, Gallus speaks in the first person; he refers to his politico/military allegiance to 'Caesar' (2–5) and to his poetry as judged by contemporary literary critics (8–9); he also addresses his mistress Lycoris (1), and reveals the emotions she stirs in him (1, 7). This is subjective elegy—political, literary-programmatic, and, not least, erotic. So any residual doubt about whether Gallus wrote subjective elegy vanished on the publication of the Gallus fragment.³⁵ In the wake of the *editio princeps* classical scholarship has advanced conflicting views on some aspects of the fragment.³⁶ But those disputes are irrelevant to the points at issue here: indisputable features of the fragment and unassailable links between the fragment and later Roman elegy confirm that within the development of elegy Gallus was fully in the line of descent from Catullus and highly influential on succeeding elegists; they also show that the panoply of elegiac motifs so prominent in his successors Tibullus and Propertius was already substantially in play in the *Amores*³⁷ of Gallus. Thus *nequitia* (1) is present, although interestingly it is the 'worthlessness' of the beloved not of the lover; the mistress is *domina*, so the *servitium amoris* machinery is in full swing; and the poet-lover is seen anticipating his patron's future triumph (4–5, cf. Propertius 3.4), an event that Gallus perhaps somehow relates to his mistress (6–7). In this way the standard Love/War antithesis of later elegy is already visible in the fragment; and the sufferings of the unhappy *neglectus amator* rejected by his unfaithful beloved also surface tantalizingly in *tristia* (1), apparently linked with Lycoris and her *nequitia*.

Apart from confirming that these archetypal elements of Roman erotic elegy were already immanent in Gallan elegy, the Qasīr Ibrīm fragment also strengthened many hypotheses about the elegies of Gallus and about their influence on his elegiac successors that had been advanced earlier by Franz Skutsch,³⁸ David O. Ross Jr.,³⁹ and others, mainly on the basis of Virgil's *Eclogues* and certain poems of Propertius. Much of what has been written about the Qasīr Ibrīm Gallus in the wake of the *editio princeps* has been devoted to noting individual confirmations of Gallus' influence on later elegy at the

³⁵ I assume that attempts to show that the Qasīr Ibrīm lines are not Gallan or/and are a forgery are erroneous.

³⁶ These are concisely documented by Courtney (1993) 259–68.

³⁷ I shall argue elsewhere that the currently fashionable attempt to deny the title *Amores* to Gallus' four books of elegies is incorrect.

³⁸ Skutsch (1901) and (1906).

³⁹ Ross (1975).

thematic or verbal level.⁴⁰ Three papers have worked with a broader brush. Cairns (1983) offered fresh arguments to support the identification of the Gallus of Propertius 1.5, 1.10, and 1.13 as Cornelius Gallus.⁴¹ Hinds (1983) studied in depth the many later reappearances of Gallus' *carmina* . . . / . . . *dicere digna* (fr. 2.6–7 Courtney) in Roman poetry.⁴² Finally Rosen-Farrell (1986) established presences of Gallus in Propertius earlier asserted by Skutsch and Ross but in need of further underpinning. *Inter alia* they showed definitively that, in adopting the *personae* of Milanion (1.1) and Acontius (1.18), Propertius was following strong hints in Gallus. They also show that in both cases Gallus had been harking back to Callimachus.

2) 'The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy'

Another group of papers produced in the 1980s and 1990s returned to the theme of 'The Origins'. The first launched an attack on Cairns (1979) Ch. 9, censuring my use of Day (1938) as a basis for discussion⁴³ instead of Jacoby (1905)—'Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie', the classic statement of the view that Roman elegy was an autonomous development. This criticism misunderstood the nature both of my procedure and of the problem. No one doubts the pre-eminence in scholarship of Jacoby over Day, but Day's monograph, which in essence reiterated Jacoby's views, set them out more systematically than had Jacoby. Day's minimalist analyses and rejections of all those pieces of evidence that undermined his thesis could therefore be refuted point by point. Moreover, although Day's main thesis has now been superseded, his work remains of considerable value because of its painstaking exploration of many dimensions of ancient erotic literature that fed into Roman elegy. It would be a shallow and unsatisfactory account of Roman subjective elegy that did not allow that, although its direct line of descent is from archaic and Hellenistic Greek subjective elegy, Roman subjective elegy also

⁴⁰ Courtney (1993) 257–70 refer to some preceding scholarship; for an earlier résumé, cf. Morelli (1985). The footnotes of Manzoni (1995) Ch. 2 contain further references.

⁴¹ In *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge 2006) I add further suggestions about Gallan influence on these and many other Propertian elegies.

⁴² Cf. also Cairns (1993). The dismissal of Hinds (1983) by Courtney (1993) *ad loc.*: "I do not think that any significance should be attached to recurrences of the banal phrase *dicere digna* in other passages of Augustan poetry." is an uncharacteristic lapse of judgment.

⁴³ Stroh (1983) 208 n. 7.

benefited from the influence of many of the other areas covered by Day, including new comedy, rhetoric, and notably epigram.

Again, it was Day's monograph and not Jacoby's paper that made standard in the Anglo-Saxon world the theory that subjective erotic elegy was an exclusively Roman development; and finally, concentration on Day was intended to distance Cairns (1979) Ch. 9 from the polemics and assumptions of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German classical scholarship. The old antitheses of poetic originality and imitation and of primary and secondary literature that animated the controversy over Roman subjective elegy between Leo and Jacoby have come to seem less and less meaningful over the intervening decades; and contemporary Hellenists and Latinists are perhaps now not so prone to assert the hegemony of one language and literature over the other. I was fully aware that in Cairns (1979) Ch. 9 I was challenging a view that had held the field since 1905, but I wanted to do this in reflective rather than polemical terms; and even though Day's monograph was itself greatly concerned with the quarrels of his predecessors, I hoped that it might help to filter them out of the discussion. Sadly, however, polemics resurfaced when the same scholar who criticized my choice of Day as prime target declared his absolute allegiance to Jacoby's position (206–10), classed those few, including myself, who have dared to think otherwise as "Dissidenten" (208 n. 7), and wrote of Cairns (1979) Ch. 9: "Er bringt jedoch nichts wesentlich Neues",⁴⁴ thereby absolving himself from the need for further argument!

One of the points made by Jacoby, and repeated emphatically by his follower (207), was that no papyrus containing a subjective hellenistic elegy had ever been discovered—and Jacoby thought that none ever would be found: "Das Dementi, das täglich ein glücklicher Papyrusfund dieser Behauptung entgegensetzen kann, erwarte ich mit Ruhe".⁴⁵ That sort of negative generalization⁴⁶ is, of course, intrinsically perilous; and the perils of this particular negation began to reveal themselves in the 1980s. It was then (1987) that the papyrus text (POxy 3723) that put the cat among the pigeons appeared. Its first editors, J. M. Bremer and P. J. Parsons, were of course fully

⁴⁴ A trend continued, with much less justification given the papyrus discoveries of the intervening years, by Syndikus (1998) 380–81.

⁴⁵ Jacoby (1905) 51 = (1961) 76.

⁴⁶ Cf. Hutchinson (2002) 7–10, 7.

aware of its potential implications, and they went to great lengths to lay matters before the scholarly public in neutral terms. They offered a clear and unambivalent date (second century AD) for the physical papyrus itself, considered possible dates for the poem itself, and examined all it might possibly imply. The fragment, which after its first edition was reprinted by Parsons (1988) 71, Morelli (1994) 385, and Butrica (1996c) 298–99, consists of twenty-three mutilated lines, all lacking either their beginning or their end. A translation can be found at Butrica (1996) 229. The poem “concerns gods and their boy-loves”.⁴⁷ However, its final preserved line (23, a hexameter) reads ψυχῇ, πρὸς τίνα μῦθον ἔχω κα. (“Soul, to what . . . do I speak . . .”, trans. J. L. Butrica). Here then, as the first editors noted, is a first-person singular verb; and someone is addressing a ‘soul’. The line may come from within the narrative or from outside it, so the speaker could be either Herakles or a narrator within the poem, or the poet—so the first editors (59, 64 ad l.23). They inclined, however, to the last view, and ended with an interesting reflection: “If the narrator is the poet, and if the *exempla* relate, as ornament or as argument, to his personal situation, we must reckon with ‘personal love-elegy’ of the Roman type.” As for the literary status and dating of the poem, they attributed the writing to “an amateur copyist” and the poem itself to “an amateur poet” (59), most probably the same person; and, after some swithering, they fixed on an imperial date for the poem.⁴⁸ Their notion of “an amateur poet” clearly caused the first editors some perplexity: surely, they argued, such a poet must have had a model, and that model must have been Greek and hellenistic; and since they perceived in the poem’s *exempla* the concept of *servitium amoris*,⁴⁹ they tentatively asked whether the “presumed model of our poet, and the presumed model of Propertius,⁵⁰ belonged to the same lost genre”.

The papers on POxy 3723 that followed the *editio princeps*⁵¹ have for the most part concentrated on restoring the defective lines and

⁴⁷ So Bremer and Parsons at *OP* 54.58.

⁴⁸ Parsons (1988) contains remarks about the poem’s date that do not always seem self-consistent and sometimes contradict those of the first edition: see Führer (1996) 67 n. 2.

⁴⁹ Morelli (1994) 402–4 sought to differentiate the *servitium amoris* topos of POxy 3723 from its Roman counterpart, but in fact the point made by Bremer and Parsons at *OP* 54.59 still stands.

⁵⁰ I.e., presumably of *servitium amoris* in Propertius(?).

⁵¹ For a list of these up to 1999, cf. Magnelli (1999) 87 n. 1.

identifying the mythical characters involved. However, two very important papers of the 1990s made it one of their central concerns to tackle the question of what relationship, if any, this text bears to Roman elegy, and hence what contribution it makes, if any, to the problem of ‘The Origins’. The two papers were written independently, and the second to be published (Butrica 1996c) was already at proof stage in late 1995 when the earlier to appear (Morelli (1994)—but actually published in late 1995) first saw the light. Butrica was able to append to his paper a one-page Addendum (322) responding to Morelli (1994), but he left the text of his paper unaltered. What is particularly valuable about these papers is that the two scholars had come quite separately to realize that three other fragmentary papyrus texts published in *OP* 39 in 1974, and then republished in *SH* in 1983,⁵² share some of the characteristics of the poem that survives in mutilated form in POxy 3723, and so can be used to confirm its nature as a subjective love-elegy. Both Morelli and Butrica identified the speaker of POxy 3723 line 23 as the poet, and both foregrounded the analogy with Latin subjective erotic elegy. But their verdicts about the date and status of POxy 3723’s verses diverged. Morelli, much of whose article is concerned with detailed exegesis and supplementation of the text of POxy 3723, accepted the date eventually proposed for it by the first editors (“Roman period”, 59), and specified in particular the second century AD (388). When it came to the literary relationships of the four papyri, Morelli explained their subjective elements by accentuating the relationship between hellenistic epigram and hellenistic elegy (on this, see also below). Because of the date assigned by Morelli to POxy 3723’s verses, the question whether they might be a hellenistic precursor of Roman elegy did not arise for him.

The burden of Butrica’s paper was quite different. He concentrated to a large extent on the structure of the four papyrus fragments, and he argued in detail that, as well as POxy 3723, the other three papyrus fragments from *OP* 39 also contain first-person remarks by their poets that stand outside the accompanying mythological material and therefore constitute subjective frames. In POxy 2885 fr. 1.1–20 = *SH* 964.1–20 Butrica (302–4) perceived subjective

⁵² POxy 2884 fr. 2 = *SH* 962; POxy 2885 fr. 1.1–20 = *SH* 964.1–20; POxy 2885 fr. 1.22–45 = *SH* 964.22–45.

addresses to a woman at the beginning (1–10) and end (17–20) of the fragment and mythological material in the center (11–16). In POxy 2885 fr. 1.22–45 = *SH* 964.22–45, a different poem by an author other than the poet of fr.1.1–20,⁵³ Butrica (305–9) identified the first twelve lines as a subjective frame addressed to someone “who is avoiding or actively fleeing” the poet (306), and he mentioned similarities both to Propertius 2.30.1–2 and to Horace *Odes* 3.27. Finally, in POxy 2884 fr. 2 = *SH* 962 Butrica (309–12) stressed the “several strikingly personal expressions in lines 10 and 13–15” (309) and analogized the fragment’s scenario with that of Tibullus 1.8 and 1.9. Another important element of Butrica’s paper is its formidable argumentation throughout on linguistic grounds for a hellenistic date for the fragments he discusses, including POxy 3723.⁵⁴

Even in the damaged condition of these fragments, the subjective nature of some of their elements seems virtually undeniable. The dating question is more elusive, but Butrica’s arguments are highly persuasive, and they resolve otherwise embarrassing difficulties. For, if the papyrus elegies were really compositions of the late first or second century AD, their relationship to Roman elegy would become highly problematic. The claim of Hose (1994), who accepts the later date, that the elegiacs of POxy 3723 were themselves influenced by Roman elegy is for historical reasons unlikely to find many adherents.⁵⁵ Must we then (as did the first editors of POxy 3723 for its elegiacs) hypothesize ‘ghost’ Hellenistic elegies as antecedents of these otherwise inexplicable alleged late first- or second-century AD Greek pieces? Occam’s razor surely seems called for here! And even if those ghost models were by some unlikely chance the correct explanation, this would not undermine the case made by Cairns (1979) Ch. 9 that hellenistic elegies of mythological content with personal frames lie behind Roman elegy: for we would still be seeing these hypothesized hellenistic elegies in the papyrus fragments—but at one remove. As regards the authorship of POxy 3723, I am at a loss to know how a poet whose language is so highly ornate, and is so innovative that twenty-three fragmentary lines produce “four words new to

⁵³ So Butrica (1996c) 305.

⁵⁴ *SH* is ambivalent about the date of the POxy 2885 fr. 1.1–20 and fr. 1.22–45: “elegiae utcunque . . . aetatem Hellenisticam (vel Romanam) redolent” (471). No date is offered for POxy 2885 fr. 2.

⁵⁵ It was immediately rejected by Morelli (1994) 420–21, cf. 407–9.

the dictionaries, two of rarer formation",⁵⁶ could be called an amateur on the basis of "his flat, sluggish composition". What sensitivity allows such a stylistic verdict to be pronounced on a set of half-lines? As for the judgment that "as a metrician, he <the poet of POxy 3723> falls short of post-Callimachean niceties", if true, might this not indicate an anterior date? Butrica's hellenistic dating is on many grounds much more attractive.⁵⁷

Both before and after the publication of POxy 3723 a number of scholars have pleaded the causes of other influences upon Latin subjective love-elegy, none of which are fact in conflict with the notion that subjectively framed hellenistic elegy played a significant part in the evolution of Roman subjective erotic elegy. Thus renewed attention has been given to Callimachus by Puelma (1982) and Rosen-Farrell (1986), and, with different emphasis, by Günther (1998): whereas Puelma and Rosen-Farrell seek to trace erotic material in Roman elegy back to Callimachus, Günther views Propertius' declaration of his derivation from Callimachus and Philetas in Book 3 (1.1–6) and his self-description as *Callimachus Romanus* in Book 4 (1.64) as attempts to legitimate the ethos of his erotic elegies by attaching them to respectable literary predecessors. Both these strands of interpretation contribute toward a holistic vision of the importance of Callimachus for Roman elegy. The significance of Catullus for the development of Roman elegy has been reemphasised by Binder-Hamm (1998), while Knox (in this volume) usefully focuses on the catalogue of poets in Propertius 2.34 in order to cast the 'neoterics' in general as an influence on Propertius; among Knox's neoterics are the Virgil of the *Eclogues* and Cornelius Gallus. Finally, the undeniable link between Roman subjective erotic elegy and hellenistic subjective erotic epigram, highlighted by Jacoby (1905) and by Day (1938) in an entire chapter (6), has again been paraded.⁵⁸ To some

⁵⁶ So the first editors, whose words are quoted in this paragraph from *OP* 54.59.

⁵⁷ Führer (1996) and (1998) also argued for a hellenistic date for POxy 3723, apparently independently of Butrica (1996c). In Führer (1998) possible Philetan authorship was suggested. Butrica (1996c) 304–5 cautiously suggested that Hermesianax is the author of *SH* 964. Most recently Spanoudakis (2004), which reached me after the completion of the present paper, has offered detailed linguistic arguments to support the view that its author is Parthenius. This proposal cannot be evaluated here, but it merits serious consideration.

⁵⁸ Morelli (1994) 405–20; Mastroiacovo (1998), discussing POxy 3723 but without knowledge of Butrica (1996c); Hutchinson (2002) 7–10.

extent older arguments have been echoed, including the tralatian observation that the two elegiac forms, elegy and epigram, are distinguished only by the artificial and imprecise criterion of length.⁵⁹ But Morelli (1994) observed in passing that hellenistic epigram cycles could encapsulate an “autobiografia amorosa esemplare” (405), and he (415–17), and independently Puelma (1996) 128–29, stressed that epigrams and elegies could coexist with seeming ease in hellenistic anthologies. In this connection they both referred to an account of *PVindob.* G 40611 (third century BC), which consists of a list of incipits and line totals (415–17).⁶⁰ The line totals show that, as well as shorter epigrams, the work to which it refers contained elegies of twenty, forty, and fifty-two lines; and another such collection (*Pap. Petrie* II.49) began with an elegy of at least twenty-four lines on the marriage of an Arsinoe (= *SH* 961). Morelli rightly noted the similarities between such collections and the *liber* of Catullus; the analogy is even stronger with the purely elegiac section of Catullus’ oeuvre (65–116).

To a large extent Günther (1998) has summed up and reconciled the varying approaches of the past twenty-five years to the problem of ‘The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy’. His paper’s main theme is not so much the origins of Roman elegy as the relationship between Hellenistic poetry and Roman elegy, and the sorts of status that Roman poets were seeking to achieve by attaching themselves to the *magna nomina* of Greek predecessors. But it contrives to do justice to all the ‘origins’ debated over this period, and it gives due prominence to hellenistic subjective love-elegy as an origin of Roman subjective love-elegy. Now that the papyri have yielded up fragments which seem most unlikely to be anything other than hellenistic subjective love-elegies, it appears that classical scholarship is closing in on this elusive quarry by the very means dismissed by Jacoby. Good hope can be entertained that the corpus of such texts will grow in the future; but no one, whatever their views on ‘The Origins’, should “calmly await” such new papyrus discoveries!

⁵⁹ Puelma (1996) and (1997) usefully underpinned this point in a detailed discussion of the history of the term ἐπίγραμμα and of its relationships with other literary terminology.

⁶⁰ Harrauer (1981). Parsons (1988) 74 also referred to this papyrus without details.

CHAPTER FIVE

PROPERTIUS AND HELLENISTIC POETRY

Adrian Hollis

The influence of Hellenistic upon Roman poetry was at its height from about 60 to 20 BC. Greek names who excited admiration included Aratus, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, Theocritus, Euphoriion, and Nicander; their Latin emulators included Helvius Cinna, Catullus, Calvus, Aemilius Macer, Varro Atacinus, Cornelius Gallus, and the young Virgil. All of the above were notable figures, though time has been unkind to several of them.¹ Propertius himself (active from the late thirties down to about 15 BC) comes in at the very end of this period, and it is interesting to investigate how far he continues the tradition of *docti poetae* into the Augustan age. We need to test the links between Propertius and individual Greek poets, but, before doing that, I would like to consider one or two passages in order to see how the pairing of poets can illuminate both. To represent the Greek side I have chosen not the obvious figure of Callimachus, but rather Euphoriion of Chalcis who flourished in the second half of the third century BC.

Euphoriion was something of a cult figure at Rome in 45 BC; Cicero then refers to his admirers as ‘cantores Euphoriionis’ (*Tusc. Disp.* 3.45).² We might have thought that the obvious Latin counterpart to Euphoriion was Helvius Cinna—both poets formidably obscure and in need of learned commentaries. But it was Cornelius Gallus who took up the poet of Chalcis, perhaps even proclaiming himself the Roman Euphoriion as Virgil in the *Eclogues* called himself the Roman Theocritus.³ And the most interesting link between Propertius and Euphoriion involves Cornelius Gallus (Prop. 2.34.91–92):

¹ Cinna, Calvus, Aemilius Macer, Varro Atacinus, and Cornelius Gallus are all to be found in Courtney (1993), and in my forthcoming *Fragments of Roman Poetry*, ca. 60 BC to AD 20 (Oxford).

² For discussion, see Lightfoot (1999) pp. 55–57.

³ *Ecl.* 10.50–1 ‘Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita versu / carmina’ (Courtney’s

et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus
mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua!

‘And recently how many wounds from fair Lycoris did Gallus after
his death wash in the waters of the Underworld!’

Scholars have long drawn a parallel between this couplet and
Euphorion fr. 43 P.:

Κόκυτός <τοι>⁴ μούνος ἄφ’ ἔλκεα νίπεν Ἄδωνιν

(Cocytus . . . alone washed Adonis’ wounds.)

One would like to know which Latin poet transferred the reference
from Adonis. Perhaps Gallus prophesied thus about his own death
from unhappy love, but it is equally possible that Gallus, like Euphorion,
was writing about Adonis, and that Propertius made the shift.

Another investigation may start from Propertius 1.9.5–6:

me non Chaoniae vincant in amore columbae
dicere, quos iuvenes quaeque puella domet.

(In the matter of love, the Chaonian doves would not outdo me in
pronouncing which young man each girl will tame.)

Why ‘Chaonian?’⁵ Because, at least according to the locals (Pausanias
7.21.3), the oracle at Dodona told the highest proportion of truth.
Propertius (and before him Virgil) may have had in mind a char-
acteristic hexameter⁶ of Euphorion (fr. 48 Powell):

Ζηνὸς Χαονίῳ προμάντιες ἠὲ δάξαντο

(‘. . . prophetesses of Chaonian Zeus pronounced’)

contention, *FLP* p. 269, that the reference is to Theocles of Chalcis, has not won
wide acceptance); compare *Ecl.* 6.1–2 ‘Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu /
nostra . . . Thalea’.

⁴ I print as Powell, but suspect that μούνος was preceded by the relative ὅς,
which followed some case other than the nominative (to avoid excessive sigmatism),
e.g., Κόκυτόν θ’ ὅς μούνος, perhaps in a list of underworld rivers. The statement of
Ptolemy Chennus (who quotes the fragment) that Cocytus here was the name of a
doctor who treated Adonis need not be taken seriously.

⁵ The first Latin poetic occurrence of ‘Chaonian’ (so called from the region of
Epirus) doves is in Virgil, *Ecl.* 9.13. We are left uncertain whether the ‘doves’ are
actual birds or human priestesses (a similar doubt over the ‘bees’ of Demeter in
Callimachus, *Hymn* 2.110).

⁶ As composed of four words and having a spondaic fifth foot.

Comparison with ἡὺδάξαντο⁷ indicates that ‘dicere’ here in Propertius is used of a solemn oracular utterance.⁸ At this point Propertius can perhaps help Euphorion, since we now have a damaged papyrus that contains some letters of the line before Euph. fr. 48 P. (*Supplementum Hellenisticum* 427.2]Δωδῶ [~ ~ ~) Propertius’ ‘columbae’ encourages restoration of Δωδῶ[νι πέλειαι at the line ending.⁹ It does look as though Propertius has the poet of Chalcis in mind—the context in Euphorion is unknown, but unlikely to be erotic.

A Latin grammarian¹⁰ speaks of Cornelius Gallus as having followed the ‘color’ of Euphorion. It is not easy to imagine what a complete poem by Euphorion might have been like, but one piece of Propertius may give us some idea of Euphorion’s *color*—melancholy but melodious, learned but (at least in Propertius) not oppressively so. This poem contains a number of motifs that are found in the remnants of Euphorion; the relative brevity of Prop. 2.26A allows full quotation:

- Vidi te in somnis fracta, mea vita, carina
 Ionio lassas ducere rore manus,
 et quaecumque in me fueris mentita fateri,
 nec iam umore gravis tollere posse comas,
 5 qualem purpureis agitatam fluctibus Hellen,
 aurea quam molli tergo vexit ovis.
 quam timui ne forte tuum mare nomen haberet,
 teque tua labens navita fleret aqua!
 quae tum ego Neptuno, quae tum cum Castore fratri,
 10 quaeque tibi excepi, iam dea, Leucothoe!
 at tu vix primas extollens gurgite palmas
 saepe meum nomen iam peritura vocas.
 quod si forte tuos vidisset Glaucus ocellos,
 esses Ionii facta puella maris,
 15 et tibi ob invidiam Nereides increpitarent,
 candida Nesaeae, caerulea Cymothoe.
 sed tibi subsidio delphinum currere vidi,
 qui, puto, Arioniam vexerat ante lyram.
 iamque ego conabar summo me mittere saxo,
 20 cum mihi discussit talia visa metus.

⁷ Compare, e.g., Callimachus, fr. 75.21 Pfeiffer (Delphic Apollo) τοῦτ’ ἔπος ἡὺδάσατο. Euphorion probably had an eye on Herodotus 2.55, where we find both προμάντιες and αὐδάξασθαι (of the dove uttering with a human voice).

⁸ Lewis and Short s.v. *dico*² 4b.

⁹ For the nominative Δωδών, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 483.

¹⁰ Probus on Virgil, *Eclogues* 10.50 (stating, wrongly, that Euphorion was an elegist).

(I saw you in a dream, my dearest, plying your tired arms over the Ionian sea, admitting all your deceptions against me and no longer able to raise your locks, heavy with water, like Helle [5] tossed on the purple waves, whom the golden ram carried on its soft back. How I feared that perhaps the sea would have your name, and that the sailor would mourn you while he made his way through your water! What vows then did I make to Neptune, to Castor and his brother, and to you, Leucothoe [10], now a goddess! But, scarcely raising your fingertips above the waves, now on the point of death you often call out my name. If by chance Glaucus had seen your fair eyes, you would have been turned into a nymph of the Ionian sea, [15] and the Nereids would chide you for envy, fair Nesace and dark Cymothoe. But I saw a dolphin hurry to your rescue—the one, I think, which previously carried Arion with his lyre. And now I was attempting to launch myself from the top of the cliff, [20] when fear drove from me this vision.)

This is surely one of Propertius' most beautiful poems. The *color* of Euphorion, associated with Cornelius Gallus but also worth seeking in Propertius,¹¹ is apparent chiefly in the swimmer's desperate efforts to avoid drowning.¹² Compare Euph. fr. 44 P.:

τὸν δ' ἐκάλυψε θάλασσα λιλαιόμενον βιότοιο,
καὶ οἱ πῆχες ἄκρον ὑπερφαίνοντο ταθέντες
ἄχρεϊ' ἀσπαίροντος ἄλις Δολοπιονίδαο
δυστήνου· ζῶην δὲ μεθ' ὕδατος ἐκβαλε πᾶσαν
χεῖρας ὑπερπλάζων, ἄλμη δ' ἐκλυσσεν ὀδόντας.

(‘Him did the sea cover, though he longed for life, and his outstretched arms were visible above the surface as the wretched offspring of Dolopion struggled abundantly but in vain; and he expelled all his life together with the water, waving his hands above his head, and the brine washed over his teeth.’)

The dolphin that hastens to Cynthia's rescue (Prop. line 17) may be paralleled by *SH* 415.16 δελφῖνες πηγοῖο δι' ὕδατος ἐγκονέεσκον (‘dolphins surged through the dark water’) and the jump into the sea (Prop. 19)¹³ by *ibid.* 14 εἰς ἄλλα δειμήνασα κατ' αἰγίλιπος θόρε πέτρης (‘... in terror jumped into the sea from a precipitous rock’). All of

¹¹ Perhaps too in Ovid, *Amores* 3.6, where the long catalogue of river gods in love differs markedly from Ovid's normal style, resembling rather Virgil's Sixth Eclogue and the ‘Collective Poetry’ represented by several papyrus fragments of Euphorion (e.g., fr. 9 Powell and others in *Suppl. Hell.*).

¹² The damaged papyrus *SH* 442.7 contained something similar (βρεκτῶν τε κομάων, ‘and of soaked hair’).

¹³ It is not clear whether this is an attempt at rescue or suicide. Propertius has imagined himself on a cliff-top—it might be worth comparing the apparent dream

this is combined by Propertius with learned but not too taxing mythology—Helle who gave her name to the Hellespont, the vicissitudes of Ino who became Leucothoe, Glaucus the amorous sea god,¹⁴ named Nereids and Arion.

Euphorion is one of the poets from whom Propertius may have drawn material relating to some quite obscure myths; e.g., the tale of Argynnus, beloved of Agamemnon (Prop. 3.7.21–2), in whose memory a shrine to Aphrodite with the cult title Argynnis was erected.¹⁵ In Euph., *SH* 428.8–9, Lobel restored Κύ[πριν / . . . Ἀργυ]ννίδα φ[ημίξ]αντο ('they called Aphrodite Argynnis'). We would expect Propertius' Hylas poem (1.20) to depend on Apollonius Rhodius¹⁶ (1.1207ff.) and Theocritus (13). But in neither of these do we find any mention of the river¹⁷ Ascanius (Prop. 1.20.15–16):

quae miser ignotis error pepessus in oris
Herculis indomito fleverat Ascanio

('things which that unhappy wanderer Hercules suffered in an unknown land when he wept by the untamed Ascanius').

The want could have been supplied by Euphorion fr. 74 P. Μυσοῖο παρ' ὕδασιν Ἀσκανίοιο ('by the waters of Mysian Ascanius'). Finally, let us consider an anonymous fragment¹⁸ on Niobe, preserved by the Byzantine churchman Michael Choniates writing after the death of his brother Nicetas in AD 1217, κωφὰ ῥέουσιν / δάκρυα ('dropping dumb tears'). Unfortunately the text of Propertius 2.20.8 is uncertain, but the well-attested 'lacrimas defluit a Sipylo' [sc. Niobe] would produce an almost identical phenomenon (the internal accusative after a normally intransitive verb). Propertius might even be imitating the anonymous Greek fragment, for whose authorship one candidate¹⁹ is Euphorion (cf. fr. 102 P.).

narration of Euph. fr. 75 P. χθιζόν μοι κνώσσοντι παρ' Ἀργανθώνιον αἶπος ('Yesterday, as I was sleeping by the Arganthonian steep . . .').

¹⁴ The subject of poems by Alexander of Aetolia (fr. 1 Powell), Callimachus (nothing survives), and (in Latin) Cornificius.

¹⁵ An alternative source could be the elegist Phanocles (fr. 5 Powell).

¹⁶ Not forgetting the Latin adaptation of Ap. Rh. by Varro Atacinus, which came on to the scene soon after 40 BC.

¹⁷ Or lake (thus Alexander of Aetolia, fr. 6 Powell, Magnelli [1999]).

¹⁸ A. S. Hollis, *CQ* 47 (1997) 578–82.

¹⁹ Another is Callimachus (A. S. Hollis, 'Callimachus: Light from Later Antiquity', in *Callimaque (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* vol. 47 [Geneva 2002] 50–51).

It has often been observed²⁰ that, as far as poetry is concerned, the Hellenistic age may be held to begin with the death, not of Alexander the Great (323 BC), but of Euripides and Sophocles (406). The most important figure thus added to Hellenistic poetry would be Antimachus of Colophon, who died perhaps between 380 and 365.²¹ We should not deduce from Catullus 95.10 'at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho' ('but let the people rejoice in turgid Antimachus') that the Colophonian was ever the preferred reading of the man in the street at Rome. Nonetheless Antimachus is a significant figure for Propertius. He is named just once (2.34.45 'tu non Antimacho, non tutior ibis Homero' ('you will go no more safely than Antimachus and Homer')). The reference to Homer seems odd, but is probably to be explained by a passage in the early third-century BC elegist Hermesianax of Colophon (fr. 7.27–34 Powell); there Homer, absurdly, is said to have been in love with Penelope. The case of Antimachus is more interesting, since he becomes the prototype for the figure of the epic (or tragic) poet who finds that all his learning and grandiloquence are of no avail when he falls in love; now he must change his style and subject matter, to become an elegist. This pattern is applied first to Ponticus (Prop. 1.7),²² who is warned (line 26) that love that comes late may come with greater force. In Prop. 1.9 the threat has materialized, and Ponticus in love is urged to sing songs such as any girl would like to hear (14).

Another friend of Propertius, Lynceus (Prop. 2.34), has not implausibly been identified with Varius Rufus;²³ his literary interests, as represented in that poem (scientific philosophy, epic, and tragedy) are appropriate enough. One of the epic illustrations strongly recalls the *Thebaid* of Antimachus (2.34.37–8):

qualis et Adraști fuerit vocalis Arion,
tristis ad Archemori funera victor equus.

('how Adrastus' Arion spoke with human voice, the horse which was victorious at the funeral of unhappy Archemorus').

²⁰ E.g., by Dover (1971) pp. lxx–lxxi.

²¹ Matthews (1996) p. 18.

²² Also a friend of Ovid (*Tristia* 4.10.47). We should probably not pay too much heed to Prop.'s suggestion of a *Thebaid*, which may denote the epic genre as a whole.

²³ See J. P. Boucher, *REA* 60 (1958) 307–22.

This was a far from commonplace myth, but the wonderful horse Arion had, it seems, been a preoccupation of Antimachus.²⁴ ‘Vocalis’ may even point to an epithet used by Antimachus, whether αὐδήεις (applied to Achilles’ talking horse in *Iliad* 19.407) or φωνήεις (of the ship Argo in Callimachus fr. 16 Pf.). Although (again) we should not press any argument that Lynceus (?Varius) actually wrote a *Thebaid*, the allusion coheres with the naming of Antimachus in line 45.

As well as a *Thebaid*, Antimachus composed a large elegiac poem, *Lyde* (frs. 67–97 Matthews), the merits and demerits of which were hotly debated in third-century Alexandria.²⁵ The most interesting testimony is given by Hermesianax (fr. 7.41–6 Powell). Unfortunately the text is corrupt at several points, but we can gather that Antimachus, struck by love for Lyde, went to the stream of the Pactolus, i.e., to Lydia (41–2 Λυδῆς δ’ Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος / πληγείς Πακτωλοῦ ῥέγμ’ ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ.²⁶ His beloved, however, died and was buried,²⁷ after which the poet left for Colophon and ‘filled sacred books²⁸ with lamentations, ceasing from all labours (γόνων δ’ ἐνεπλήσατο / βίβλους / ἱράς, ἐκ παντὸς πανσάμενος καμάτου (45–46)’. ‘Ceasing from all labors’ is puzzling.²⁹ I suspect that the meaning may be ‘ceasing to work upon his *Thebaid*’; Antimachus is called ‘unwearied’ (ἀκαμάτου . . . Ἀντιμάχοιο) in a poem by Antipater of Sidon³⁰ that seems more relevant to the *Thebaid* than to the *Lyde*.³¹ If so, Antimachus is portrayed by Hermesianax as having been induced by love to abandon the grand style of epic in favor of more intimate elegy. That is the pattern of Propertius’ poems addressed to Ponticus (1.7 and 1.9) and Lynceus (2.34); the latter must leave his present style and themes (2.34.1–2 ‘desine . . .’) and take up the lighter genre (43 ‘incipere . . .’).

²⁴ See Matthews’ (1996) General Index, p. 475. Compare Statius, *Theb.* 11.442–3 ‘fata monentem / . . . Ariona’.

²⁵ In favor: Asclepiades, *Anth. Pal.* 9.63 = Antimachus test. 13 Matthews, and Posidippus, *Anth. Pal.* 12.168 = Ant. test. 14; against, Callimachus fr. 398 Pf. = Ant. test. 15^A.

²⁶ Perhaps imitating Antimachus fr. 93 M. Πακτωλοῦ χρυσέοισιν ἐπ’ ἀνδῆροισι θάασσον, ‘I sat upon the golden banks of Pactolus’.

²⁷ Lines 43–44 (corrupt).

²⁸ One should not put weight on the plural, but we happen to know that *Lyde* contained at least two books (see fr. 85 M.).

²⁹ Could παντός be corrupt?

³⁰ *Anth. Pal.* 7.409 = Test. 19 Matthews, line 1.

³¹ Thus Gow/Page (1965) vol. II p. 87, challenged by Cameron (1995) 332–34.

Slightly older than Callimachus, Philetas of Cos³² won the majority of votes for the position of Greece's second elegist (Quintilian 10.1.58 'princeps habetur Callimachus, secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit'). Few verbatim fragments have survived, and the only certain papyrus additions come from commentaries on other works (*Suppl. Hell.* 673 and 674).³³ Philetas does indeed appear several times in Propertius. Twice he is given his own name (2.34.31; 3.1.1), twice described by the epithet 'Phileteus' (3.3.52; 4.6.3), once called 'the Coan' without his name (3.9.44),³⁴ as more often in Ovid. Nearly always Philetas is linked with Callimachus, no doubt because of the pair's reputation as the two leading Greek elegists.³⁵ Many modern scholars³⁶ have expressed doubts whether the Romans possessed a full text of Philetas' poems. I agree that one should hesitate to argue that all allusions in Propertius go back directly to Philetas. For example, Prop. 4.6.3 'Phileteis . . . corymbis' might be drawn from Meleager's characterization of Leonidas of Tarentum (*Anth. Pal.* 4.1.15 θαλερούς κισσοῖο κορύμβους).³⁷ 'Philetea . . . aqua' (Prop. 3.3.52) arouses suspicion that Propertius has substituted Philetas for Callimachus purely for metrical convenience.³⁸

At least two references to Philetas in Propertius seem more promising. First Prop. 2.34.31–2 = Philetas test. 23b Spanoudakis, 'tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philetan / et non inflati somnia Callimachi.'

³² Recently edited by L. Sbardella (Rome 2000) and K. Spanoudakis (2002).

³³ Of course a grave difficulty is that (unless we discovered the beginning or end of a poem with the author's own name attached) we could only identify a papyrus fragment of Philetas if it overlapped with a quotation already ascribed to the Coan—and there are so few of these. Therefore it is possible that something by Philetas survives unrecognized among our anonymous papyri.

³⁴ This usage goes back to Hellenistic times: in the new Posidippus (*Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi*, eds. G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi (Milan, 2001) col. x. 25 Philetas (named in the first line of the epigram) is just Κώϊος ἀνὴρ. In Callimachus fr. 532 τῷ ἵκελον τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κώϊον ('like to that is the Coan writing'), to be discussed below, perhaps the poetry of Philetas is being compared to fine Coan draperies.

³⁵ Quintilian (quoted above).

³⁶ E.g., Lightfoot (1999) p. 88 'It is highly dubious whether Philetas had ever been read by Propertius and Ovid.'

³⁷ Similarly Philip, *Anth. Pal.* 4.2.7 on Crinagoras.

³⁸ Note, however, Antipater of Thessalonica, *Anth. Pal.* 11.20.3–4 οἵ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες / κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ ('you who, practicing a contorted elegance of poetry, drink plain water from a sacred spring'). ἐπέων κόσμον might glance at Philetas fr. 25 Spanoudakis = 10 Powell .3; if so, Antipater's water-drinking might also come from Philetas. But that is a long shot.

The text of the hexameter is very uncertain, and many emendations have been proposed.³⁹ Whatever the true reading in the hexameter, the very specific allusion in the pentameter to Callimachus' dream ('somnia Callimachi,' i.e., frs. 2ff.) seems to require, for balance, something equally personal to Philetas. For 'memorem,' E. A. Barber⁴⁰ compared Antipater of Thessalonica, *Anth. Pal.* 11.31 = 37 Gow—Page 4 μύθων μνήμονας ὕδροπότας.⁴¹ The other interesting allusion starts from the opening line of Propertius, Book 3:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philetas

(‘Shades of Callimachus and rites of Coan Philetas’).

One may wonder how literally to take the ‘sacra’, but comparison with 3.9.45–46 (immediately after a mention of Philetas)

haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas
meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant!

(‘Let these verses inflame boys and girls; let them proclaim me a god and make offerings to me!’)

suggests that Propertius means what he says. The idea of poets receiving semi-divine honours was familiar to the Greeks; Delphian Apollo was believed to have made such a pronouncement in favour of Archilochus, and Posidippus coveted the same status for himself.⁴² Philetas may well either have received such worship or (perhaps more probably) have expressed the hope of it somewhere in his own poetry.⁴³ Finally, Philetas plays a part in one of Propertius' most ingenious passages. At the start of Book Two Propertius insists that his inspiration comes not (as it did for Callimachus) from the Muses or Apollo, but wholly from Cynthia herself (2.1.3–4 ‘non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo: / ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit’). In different moods or settings she may inspire Callimachean *Aetia* of which no one has heard before (12 ‘invenio causas mille poeta novas’,

³⁹ Goold (1990) prints Santen's ‘Musis levioem’ for ‘memorem Musis.’

⁴⁰ *CR* 46 (1932) 127.

⁴¹ The primary reference is to the proverbial drinking partner who remembers what is said, but it is hard not to think of poets who belong to the Callimachean tendency (as in *Anth. Pal.* 11.20, quoted in n. 38 above). See Spanoudakis (2002) p. 62.

⁴² *SH* 704.9–15 (the general sense is clear, even though the text is corrupt and lacunose).

⁴³ I have discussed this possibility more fully in Hollis (1996).

a full-length *Iliad* (14 ‘tūm vero longas condimus Iliadas’) or a mythical narrative (16 ‘maxima de nihilo nascitur historia’). The first example reads as follows (2.1.5–6):

sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere vidi,
totum de Coa veste volumen erit.

(‘If I have seen her process shining in Coan silk, the whole volume will be composed of Coan dress.’)

It seems almost certain that Propertius is picking up a comparison, made already by Callimachus, between the fineness of Coan draperies and that of Philetas’ poetry.⁴⁴

Callimachus himself is never actually named in Propertius’ first book, which contains fewer, and perhaps less striking, echoes of the Cyrenean. But it would be a mistake to argue that Propertius at that early stage of his career had not yet discovered Callimachus, since Book I includes the most instructive adaptation of a love story from third-person narrative in a Hellenistic poem (Callimachus, frs. 67–75, *Aetia* Book 3) to first-person in Latin elegy (Propertius 1.18). On the Greek side we have Acontius, desperately in love with Cydippe, in the most famous (and, by good luck, the best preserved) episode from the *Aetia*. Struck by remorse for the trick with which he made Cydippe swear to marry him, Acontius ‘went to the countryside on every pretext’ (fr. 72). There he wishes that the trees could speak his beloved’s name, ‘or at least that you could bear carved upon your bark letters which say “Cydippe is fair”’ (fr. 73).⁴⁵ Carving of the beloved’s name upon a tree was probably to be found, before Propertius, in the elegies of Cornelius Gallus.⁴⁶

As well as the preserved fragments of Callimachus’ Acontius and Cydippe, we also possess a prose paraphrase (in places very close) of the poem, by the Erotic Epistolographer Aristaenetus;⁴⁷ the parallels were clearly set out by Francis Cairns.⁴⁸ I suspect that at one point (covered by Propertius) Aristaenetus has misunderstood the Callimachean original. When Propertius writes (1.18.19–20)

⁴⁴ See n. 34 above.

⁴⁵ No doubt suggested by the custom of inscribing ‘So and so is fair’ (more often a boy than a girl) on Attic vases.

⁴⁶ See Virgil, *Eclogues* 10.53–54 (in the mouth of Cornelius Gallus).

⁴⁷ Date uncertain, perhaps as late as AD 500 (C. D. N. Costa, *Greek Fictional Letters* (Oxford, 2001) p. xvi).

⁴⁸ CR 83 = NS 20 (1969) 131–34.

vos eritis testes, si quos habet arbor amores,
fagus et Arcadio pinus amica deo,

(‘You will be my witnesses, if a tree has any loves, beech and pine dear to the Arcadian god.’)

he surely has in mind human beings or nymphs who were transformed into trees.⁴⁹ Aristaenetus, however, asks (*Epist.* 1.10) whether trees ever fall in love with each other: ‘Do you too experience this love? Did the cypress, perhaps, fall in love with the pine, or some other plant with another one?’ As an interpretation of Callimachus, this seems unlikely, almost absurd.

Let us leave Callimachus and consider briefly some other Hellenistic influences upon Propertius’ *Monobiblos*. A great service to Latin poetry was performed by Meleager of Gadara when (about 100 BC) he collected epigrams to form his *Garland*.⁵⁰ Meleager was no mean poet himself, and Propertius in the very first lines of his first elegy makes the debt apparent (1.1.1–4):

Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis
contactum nullis ante cupidinibus.
tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus
et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus.

(‘Cynthia was the first to make me captive (poor wretch) with her eyes, when I had not previously been touched with any desires. Then Love cast down my looks of resolute disdain, and trod my head beneath his feet.’)

Compare Meleager, *Anth. Pal.* 12.101 = 103 Gow – Page 1–4):

τόν με πόθοις ἄτρωτον ὑπὸ στέρνοισι Μυίσκος
ῥμμασι τοξεύσας τοῦτ’ ἐβόησεν ἔπος·
‘τὸν θρασὺν εἶλον ἐγὼ· τὸ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀφρύσι κείνο φρύαγμα
σκηπτροφόρου σοφίας ἠνίδε ποσσὶ πατῶ.’

(‘When I was unwounded by desires, Myiscus shot me in the heart with his eyes, and shouted out ‘I have captured the bold one, and

⁴⁹ The pine tree had originally been the nymph Pitys, loved by Pan (no similar myth about the *fagus* (beech tree) is known). For arboreal transformations, see P. M. C. Forbes Irving, *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths* (Oxford, 1990) 260ff. Catalogues of trees partly in terms of their mythical history are found in Ovid, *Met.* 10.86ff., [Virgil], *Culex* 123ff.

⁵⁰ For text and commentary, see Gow-Page (1968), and for discussion K. Gutzwiller (1998).

(see!) I tread underfoot the arrogance of sceptre-bearing Wisdom that sat upon his brow’.”)⁵¹

Of all the poems in Propertius Book I, the richest in Hellenistic coloring is undoubtedly 1.20 (Hylas). We are able to compare it with Apollonius Rhodius (1.1207ff.) and Theocritus (13.25ff.); there may be other poets in the background—we have mentioned (above, with n. 17) that the river (or lake) Ascanius (Prop. 1.20.4) is not to be found in Apollonius or Theocritus but may have come from Euphorion or Alexander of Aetolia. Hylas also appeared in the *Heteroeumena* of Nicander (fr. 48). Of Propertius’ learned names in this poem, *Pege / Pegae* (1.20.33) figured in Ap. Rh. (1.1222), as did *Arganthus* (1.20.33 ‘*Arganthi . . . montis*’, cf. 1.1178 Ἀργανθώνειον ὄρος).⁵² These names (or adjectives derived from them) become ever longer and more sonorous, e.g., 6 ‘*Thiodamanteo*’⁵³ *proximus ardor Hylae*’, 31 ‘*iam Pandioniae cessit genus Orithyiae*’, in the style of a poet like Euphorion.⁵⁴ The story is introduced in the best Hellenistic/neoteric manner with ‘*namque ferunt olim . . .*’ (17).⁵⁵ Such invoking of literary tradition may in fact draw attention to a very rare (even unique) version of the myth; that applies in the present case to Propertius’ portrayal of Calais and Zetes as aggressive lovers of Hylas.⁵⁶ As well

⁵¹ Propertius was not the first Latin poet to open his book with an imitation of Meleager: Catullus 1 clearly reflects Meleager 4.1.1ff. (the Introduction to the whole *Stephanos*); in both cases the poet wonders to whom he can dedicate his new volume, before hitting upon a suitable recipient). We shall later (p. 000) discuss the incorporation by Latin poets of very close adaptations of Greek epigrams, in connection with Prop. 3.13.43ff.

⁵² For the eponym, see Lightfoot (1999) pp. 552–55.

⁵³ Words of this shape, derived from proper names, may occupy the whole first half of a pentameter (or indeed a hexameter), as in Callimachus, fr. 21.4 Λαομεδοντείωι (which became a favorite among the Latin poets, starting from Virgil, *Georgics* 1.502).

⁵⁴ It is worth drawing attention to a trick personal to Propertius, which he could not have learned from Euphorion—that of balancing proper names between hexameter and pentameter within the elegiac couplet (e.g., 2.28.51–52 *vobiscum Antiope, vobiscum candida Tyro; / vobiscum Europe, nec proba Pasiphae*). Such a consideration favours Butrica’s emendation ‘*Erinnae*’ in 2.3.22, and Jortin’s ‘*Lanuvium*’ in 2.32.6, where one of the transmitted readings, ‘*ducit anus*,’ would make sense but fail to provide balance.

⁵⁵ Compare, e.g., Callimachus fr. 75.4 Ἥρην γὰρ κοτέ φασι (‘For they say that once upon a time Hera . . .’)—a delicious self-parody, since the poet immediately stops himself from any indiscreet revelation—Catullus 64.76 ‘*nam perhibent olim . . .*’

⁵⁶ In Ap. Rh. 1.1298ff. these sons of Boreas and Orithyia persuade the Argonauts not to turn back to search for Heracles and Hylas, thus earning the deadly hatred of the former. In the elegist Phanocles (fr. 1 Powell) Calais, one of the brothers, is loved by Orpheus.

as learning, Prop. 1.20 exhibits an attractive ironical humour: Gallus' boyfriend is 'not unequal in renown' ('non nomine dispar,' 5)⁵⁷ to Hylas the king's son,⁵⁸ and the predatory females at the pleasure resort of Baiae are described as 'Ausonian [i.e., Italian] Dryads' (1.20.12), no less amorous than their Mysian sisters.

In general Propertius draws about equally from Apollonius and Theocritus; to the latter he owes the framing of the myth as advice to a friend, and the *locus amoenus* of the spring,⁵⁹ appropriate to the lighter poetic genres. But the most striking (as well as the strangest) Hellenistic reminiscence in Propertius 1.20 comes from neither of these great poets—rather from a second-rank figure, Alexander of Aetolia (fr. 3.22 Powell, Magnelli).⁶⁰ In Alexander a married woman asks a young man who has rejected her to retrieve a golden bucket that (she claims) has fallen down a well. When he goes down to fetch it she kills him by heaving a millstone upon his head (fr. 3.31). Her false account of the lost bucket includes the line (22)

αὐτὼς δ' ἐς Νύμφας ὄιχετ' ἐφ' ὕδριάδας
(. . . and went in vain to the water nymphs.)

When Hylas does to his death by drowning in the pool, Propertius writes (1.20.32)

a dolor! ibat Hylas, ibat Hamadryasin
(‘Alas! Hylas went, he went to the wood nymphs.’)

Both lines stick in the memory, and one can hardly doubt Propertius' use of the Aetolian. The two contexts have something in common: the loss of a bucket⁶¹ that falls into water and the death of a good-looking prince. We may wonder whether Propertius' tree nymphs

⁵⁷ So I would interpret the phrase. One might compare Horace, *Odes* 2.4.15–16, where the poet ironically suggests that Xanthias' girlfriend must be a princess who fell on hard times.

⁵⁸ Theocritus does not mention Hylas' father Thiodamas; Callimachus (fr. 24.13) had made him cruel and brutal, but Apollonius is more sympathetic (*Arg.* 1.1213ff.).

⁵⁹ Id. 13.39ff., Prop. 1.20.33ff. It is worth reading Charles Segal, 'Death by Water: A Narrative Pattern in Theocritus,' in his *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil* (Princeton, 1981) 47–65.

⁶⁰ The fragment of Alexander and the prose source that quotes it (Parthenius, *Ἑρωτικά Παθήματα* 14) are discussed in detail by Lightfoot (1999) pp. 454–70.

⁶¹ Hylas' bucket (to fetch water for a meal) is mentioned several times by Apollonius and Theocritus, but—curiously—never in Propertius, where the boy drinks only for himself, with cupped hands (1.20.43).

(Hamadryads) should be emended to water nymphs; if so, Baehrens' 'Ephydriasin' would be closest to the Greek.⁶² A more interesting question is how Propertius came to know the line of Alexander. Was he directly conversant with the poems of this relatively minor figure? I would not rule that out; those who doubt whether Roman poets possessed a text of Philetas⁶³ may look for a different solution. Could Propertius have known the Ἑρωτικά Παθήματα that Parthenius collected for Cornelius Gallus, including the passages of Greek poetry quoted therein? Later we shall see, in connection with 4.4.89–90, that Propertius may have been familiar with lines cited by Parthenius from one of Apollonius' minor poems.⁶⁴

The first mention of Callimachus by name⁶⁵ comes at the end of a long *recusatio* enumerating all the categories of epic poetry to which Propertius feels himself unequal (2.1.39–40):

sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus
intonat angusto pectore Callimachus

(But neither does Callimachus thunder forth from his narrow breast
the Phlegraeian riots of Jupiter and Enceladus.)

Straightaway we find that several individual words in the Propertian couplet contain specific allusions to Callimachus, but their sense and application may be twisted in an idiosyncratic way, producing a curiously fragmented impression. The most obvious reminiscence is 'intonat', from βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός ('Thundering is not my province, but belongs to Zeus')⁶⁶ in the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1.20).⁶⁷ Enceladus too had appeared in the *Aetia* prologue—representing, however, not the grandiloquent epic theme of Gigantomachia (war between the Giants and the Olympian gods) but the burden of old age that bears

⁶² 'Adryasin' (if correct in line 12) and 'Dryades' (45) suggest that we should retain the tree nymphs.

⁶³ See n. 36 above.

⁶⁴ Lightfoot (1999) pp. 297–301 discusses possible use of the Ἑρωτικά Παθήματα by later writers; the only explicit reference to that work is in [Probus] on Virgil, *Ecl.* 3.62, 'Parthenius in volumine quod ei de amantibus compositum est.'

⁶⁵ Earlier in the same poem (2.1.12) 'causas' clearly suggests the title of Callimachus' *Aetia*.

⁶⁶ 'Iovis' has some relationship to Διός, though the context is different.

⁶⁷ Closer to the original (because Apollo there is giving advice) would be Prop. 4.1.34 'et vetat insano verba tonare Foro' ('and forbids you to thunder forth words in the crazy Forum').

down upon the poet. 'Angusto' must be significant, since it is repeated with emphasis in line 45 referring to the lovers' narrow bed. Again, this word seems to have a Callimachean origin in the 'narrower' (στενιοτέρην) path of the poet's chariot (Call. fr. 1.28). Even the 'battles' (Prop. 2.1.45 'proelia') of the bed may reflect the deeds of 'kings or heroes' that Callimachus' critics (fr. 1.3–5) would like him to celebrate.

The above comparisons, on the Callimachean side, are all drawn from the prologue to the *Aetia*, which, together with the linked Dream (fr. 2 Pf.)⁶⁸ and the ending of the *Hymn to Apollo* (2.105–13) with its motif of drinking from the pure spring (110–12), was undoubtedly the most influential passage of Callimachus.⁶⁹ The first three poems of Propertius 3 form a cycle, and Callimachean imagery appears in greatest profusion in poems 1 and 3—appropriately enough, since the Cyrenean's name is the first word of the whole book (3.1.1 'Callimachi Manes . . .'). In 3.1.9–10 Propertius ingeniously conflates Roman triumphal motifs with the terminology of Callimachus: 'a me / nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis' ('the Muse born from me triumphs with garlanded horses'), adapted from Callimachus' retort to his critics: μηδ' ἄπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέουσιν αἰοιδήν / τίκτεσθαι ('do not expect a song which makes a great booming noise to be born from me', fr. 1.19–20). The path to the Muses is 'not broad' (14 'non datur ad Musas currere lata via'), as in Callimachus (fr. 1.27 μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, 'and not along the broad way'), the return journey 'untouched' (18 'intacta . . . via') like Callimachus' κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτους (fr. 1.27–28 'untrodden roads'). Apollo, who advises and commends the two poets, bears the same cult title, 'Lycian.' Finally there are hints of the jealous rivals who attacked both Callimachus (fr. 1.1ff., cf. *Hymn* 2.105ff.) and Propertius (3.1.21 'invida turba').

I confess to feeling that Propertius has somewhat overworked his Callimachean motifs. That applies even more to Prop. 3.3, despite the luxuriant and seductive quality of its dream setting (1–2):

⁶⁸ Cf. Prop. 2.34.32, quoted on p. 104 above.

⁶⁹ The large book of Wimmel (1960) is mainly devoted to Latin imitations of these passages. It would, however, be wrong to deduce that the Romans were not familiar with other poems by Callimachus (the easiest case to establish is that of Ovid). These same passages are discussed in a sensitive and thought-provoking way by Hutchinson (1988), ch. 6, 'Roman Poetry.'

Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra
Bellerophonteï qua fluit umor equi

(‘I had seemed to be reposing in the soft shade of Helicon, where flows the liquid of Bellerophon’s horse.’)⁷⁰

Propertius’ Helicon seems too much cluttered with poetic symbols.⁷¹ After the standard speech from Apollo (15–26) there follows another speech very much along the same lines (though more specific on the subjects to be avoided) from the Muse Calliope. Presumably the poet wants to recall the subsequent parts of *Aetia* 1–2, in which Callimachus had conversed with individual Muses (Calliope first in fr. 7.22). Yet even in territory much traveled over by followers of Callimachus our poet is capable of ingenuity.

Let us return to 3.1.12–14 where Propertius portrays his competitors as following behind him in chariots:

scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas.
quid frustra immissis in me certatis habenis?
non datur ad Musas currere lata via.

(A crowd of writers followed my wheels. Why do you vainly compete with me, letting your reins loose? In hurrying to the Muses no broad road is given.)

Here the image has changed from that of a Roman triumph (lines 9–11) to a race in which Propertius is the leader and the track is too narrow to allow overtaking—an unexpected use of Callimachus’ μηδ’ οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν (see above). There is no hint that Callimachus envisaged a race, but Propertius seems to have incorporated what we might call a proto-Hellenistic poet, Choerilus of Samos.⁷² In *Suppl. Hell.* 317 Choerilus compares himself, as an epic poet born too late, to the back-marker in a chariot race who has no chance of making progress because of the unbroken ranks of chariots ahead of him (lines 4–5):

ὔστατοι ὥστε δρόμου καταλειπόμεθ’, οὐδέ πη ἔστι
πάντηι παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἄρμα πελάσσαι.

⁷⁰ The spring Hippocrene.

⁷¹ E. L. Bowie (*CQ* 35 (1985) 83–85) argues that Propertius 3.3 is indebted to Hesiod, Philetas, and Callimachus, which might account for a certain overcrowding in Propertius’ Helicon.

⁷² A good writer (see A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 130 [2000] 13–15), not to be confused with Alexander the Great’s wretched court poet, Choerilus of Iasus.

(We are left behind like the last in a race, and though I peer in every direction there is no possibility for me to bring close my newly-yoked chariot.)

Propertius has reversed the position of Choerilus; our poet enjoys an unassailable lead over his rivals, while the latter's situation offers no hope of improvement. Note also that Choerilus had spoken of a 'meadow' (λειμών, line 2) rather than a road, which may be the source of 'prata' in Prop. 3.3.18.

No less ingenious is the way in which Propertius links his own Callimachean aesthetics to the life style of his patron Maecenas (3.9.23ff.). Maecenas is well qualified to hold any of the great offices of state, but preferred to be not even a senator (29):

parcis et in tenuis⁷³ humilem te colligis umbras

('You show restraint, and modestly withdraw to an insignificant privacy.')

Drawing a parallel between the restraint of his patron's life style and the fineness of his own poetry, Propertius disingenuously promises that, if Maecenas were to lead the way (by taking on the burdens of government), his protégé too would alter his principles and attempt the themes that are normally out of bounds for a Callimachean poet (47–48).⁷⁴

te duce vel Iovis arma canam caeloque minantem
Coeum et Phlegraeis Eurymedonta iugis

('If you led the way I would sing even of the battles of Zeus, of Coeus threatening heaven and Eurymedon on the hills of Phlegra.')

We mentioned earlier (p. 107) that the first four lines of Propertius Book 1 are closely based upon an epigram by Meleager of Gadara—testimony to the importance for Latin poetry of the anthology

⁷³ It is hard not to think that the word carries here at least something of the Callimachean λεπτός, λεπταλέος (see, however, Hutchinson 1988, 281–82); for the actual use of 'tenuis' in a literary-critical context one could cite Prop. 3.1.8 (note the verb 'tenuastis' of Callimachus and Philetas in 3.1.5), Horace, *Epist.* 2.1.225.

⁷⁴ So I would interpret the passage, though there are other possibilities (for discussion, see Hubbard [1975], 111–15). Romulus and Remus, the foundation of Rome and the city's earliest years could be a small-scale theme, in the tradition of Callimachus' *Aetia*, Propertius 4, and Ovid's *Fasti*, but equally a grand theme inspired by Ennius' *Annales*. I would favor the latter, since Propertius here contemplates (even if insincerely) taking on more ambitious tasks.

(‘Garland’) of epigrams which Meleager collected about 100 BC. It is worth returning briefly to this topic; in particular to Propertius 3.13. Part of the poem has a distinctly pastoral air. Guy Lee once played an amusing game: he selected passages from the elegists which looked as though they had been written by one of their colleagues. Any person who had a feel for Latin poetry but had not read the elegists recently could well think that Prop. 3.13.25–30 came from the pen of Tibullus, including lines 43–46:

et leporem, quicumque venis, venaberis, hospes,
 et si forte meo tramite quaeris avem:
 et me Pana tibi comitem de rupe vocato,
 sive petes calamo praemia, sive cane.

(‘Whoever you are who come here, stranger, you will hunt along my path both the hare and (if that is your object) the bird. And whether you pursue your prize with rod or hound, call from the rock for me, Pan, to be your companion.’)

These lines are in fact quite a close translation by Propertius of Leonidas of Tarentum, *Anth. Pal.* 9.337 = 29 Gow – Page:⁷⁵

Εὐάγρει, λαγόθηρα, καὶ εἰ πετεηνὰ διώκων
 ἰξευτῆς ἦκεις τοῦθ’ ὑπὸ δισσὸν ὄρος
 κάμῃ τὸν ὕληωρὸν ἀπὸ κρημνοῖο βόασον
 Πᾶνα· συναγρεύω καὶ κυσὶ καὶ καλάμοις.

(Good hunting, chaser of the hare, or if in pursuit of birds you come to the foot of this two-peaked hill.⁷⁶ Call from the rock upon me too, Pan the forest ranger—I join the hunt both with dogs and rod.)

Only a little less close is the relationship between Prop. 2.9.37–40 and Posidippus, *Anth. Pal.* 12.45 = 5 Gow – Page.⁷⁷

We have seen that Propertius names Callimachus in the first and last poems of Book 2,⁷⁸ and in the very first word of Book 3. Thus,

⁷⁵ Gow – Page (1965) write (vol. II, p. 339): ‘The quatrain enjoyed a popularity beyond its apparent merits . . . Perhaps it owed its celebrity to having been inscribed on some famous statue or in some well-known place.’

⁷⁶ Hence the idea that the poem was associated with a particular locale.

⁷⁷ Close imitation of epigrams from the *Garland of Meleager* can be found in other Latin poets of this period: e.g. Lucretius 4.181–2 = 910–11 from Antipater of Sidon, *Anth. Pal.* 7.713 = 58 G. – P. (Lucr., as far as possible, fits his words into the same metrical position as their Greek counterparts), Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.105ff. from Callimachus, *Anth. Pal.* 12.102 = 1 G. – P. Hor., *Sat.* 1.2.119ff. seem likely to translate a lost epigram by Philodemus (30 in Gow–Page 1965)).

⁷⁸ Although it seems virtually certain that Book 2 as we have it contains parts

the relationship with Callimachus seems to grow closer. Nonetheless, one may feel that the 'quest for Callimachus'⁷⁹ has not reached a very definite conclusion in positive terms, even if it may have indicated, negatively, a style and themes to be avoided. Unlike Margaret Hubbard⁸⁰ I do not see any promise of a future Roman *Aetia* in Propertius 3.9.

In the first poem of Book 4 Propertius actually claims to be the Roman Callimachus (4.1.64 'Umbria Romani patria Callimachi' ('Umbria, homeland of the Roman Callimachus')). Here, it seems, Callimachus is introduced not just as the acknowledged master of Greek elegy, nor even as the practitioner of a fine and fastidious style, but (more straightforwardly) as the foremost composer of aetiological and antiquarian poetry. Propertius' general commitment to this genre is expressed by 4.1.69 'sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum' ('I shall sing of rites, festivals and the old names of places'). One may feel that insufficient attention is paid to the separate components of this programme, but 'religious rites' are to the fore in poems 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10; 'festivals' in 4 and 6 and 'old names of places' ('Tarpeian' rather than 'Capitoline')⁸¹ also in 4. Callimachus' four books of *Aetia* had been divided into two pairs: Books 1–2 integrated by the poet's conversation with the Muses,⁸² 3–4 containing a series of quite separate poems. It is the second pair which provides the more important model for Propertius.⁸³

Only in the recent past has it become clear that *Aetia* 3 began, and *Aetia* 4 ended, with substantial poems in honor of the Ptolemies, the Macedonian dynasty which ruled Egypt. The opening poem is usually⁸⁴ known as 'Victoria Berenices', combining celebration of the young queen's chariot victory at Nemea with the mythical foundation

of more than one book, 2.34 shows every sign of being the final poem of a book—the catalogue of poets whom Propertius hopes to join is obviously reflected in the concluding poem (15) of Ovid, *Amores* 1.

⁷⁹ To quote the title of Hubbard (1975) ch. 3.

⁸⁰ See n. 74 above.

⁸¹ What scholarly Greeks called μετονομασίαι, 'changes of name', of which Callimachus' *Aetia* provides numerous examples (e.g. fr. 75.62–63).

⁸² The more important model for Ovid's *Fasti*, in which conversations with supernatural beings abound.

⁸³ I see no need to view the aetiological poems of Propertius 4 as fragments of an abandoned project for a larger Roman *Aetia*.

⁸⁴ Following P. J. Parsons (*ZPE* 25 (1977) 1–50). For the full text, see *SH* 254–268C.

of the Nemean Games by Heracles and the hero's entertainment on that occasion (before he killed the Nemean lion) by the old man Molorcus. At the end of *Aetia* 4⁸⁵ stood 'Coma Berenices', in which a lock of the queen's hair tells how it was dedicated in a temple for the safe return of King Ptolemy III from warfare in Syria, and subsequently carried up to become a new constellation in the sky.

We can now see that praise of the ruler was by no means alien to Callimachus' *Aetia*—an observation relevant to Propertius 4, as (later) to Ovid's *Fasti*. Particularly Prop. 4.6⁸⁶ deserves to be viewed in this light. The poem unmistakably sets itself in the aetiological mode, explaining the origin of the Palatine temple and the cult of Actian Apollo (4.6.67–8):

Actius hinc traxit Phoebus monumenta, quod eius
una decem vicit missa sagitta rates.

('From this Actian Apollo derived his temple, because the discharge of one of his arrows overcame ten ships.')

The battle itself hardly appears: Apollo fires his quiverfull, Octavian's spear follows, and, in less than three complete lines (55–57), the victory is won. Much the same could be said of Ptolemy's Syrian war in Callimachus: complete victory, and on the grandest possible scale,⁸⁷ is almost taken for granted (Catullus 66.35–36):⁸⁸

is haut in tempore longo
captam Asiam Aegypti finibus addiderat.

('In no long time he had added captive Asia to the territory of Egypt.')

The conquest is made to sound like a minor matter, certainly less interesting and important than the fate of Berenice's lock of hair.

At the beginning of this poem (lines 3–4) Propertius has made a special point of setting the piece in the genre of Callimachus and Philetas. When he writes 'pura novum vati laurea mollit iter' (10, 'a pure spray of laurel⁸⁹ smoothes a new path for the bard') we may

⁸⁵ Fr. 110 Pfeiffer. The placing is established by a note in the Diegeses (summaries of the plot) on *Aetia* 4 (Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* vol. I, p. 123).

⁸⁶ A poem that generally has not been well-received (see, e.g., Williams 1968, 51ff.).

⁸⁷ Ptolemy's Adulis inscription (OGIS 54) was hardly more restrained.

⁸⁸ At this point the Greek text is missing, and we must use Catullus' Latin.

⁸⁹ The laurel (associated with Apollo) suggests military victory as well as lustration, 'mollit' the elegiac metre (in contrast to the more robust hexameter).

sigh at yet another imitation of Callimachus' 'untrodden paths' (fr. 1.27–28), but Propertius is emphasizing that he has transferred the battle-scene from the usual heroic hexameter to the lighter genre of elegy. Hence the picturesque artificialities like Nereus curving the lines of ships into two crescents, and the tremulous reflection of weapons upon the sunlit water (25–6 'tandem aciem geminos Nereus lunarat in arcus, / armorum et radiis icta tremebat aqua'). People may still feel (like Gordon Williams) that comparison of Propertius' poem with Virgil's picture of Actium on the Shield of Aeneas (*Aen.* 8.675ff.) greatly favors the latter, but one should recognize that Propertius is attempting something quite different, and perhaps more difficult.

The opening lines of Propertius' Fourth Book confront us with a pattern that, more than any other, seems characteristic of Latin aetiological and antiquarian poetry, the contrast between Rome's past simplicity and present magnificence (4.1.1–4):⁹⁰

Hoc quodcumque vides, hospes, qua maxima Roma est,
ante Phrygem Aenean collis et herba fuit;
atque ubi navali stant sacra Palatia Phoebus,
Evandri profugae procubuere boves.

(All this that you see before you, stranger, where greatest Rome stands, was grass and hill before Phrygian Aeneas; and, where stands the Palatine sacred to naval Phoebus, the cattle of refugee Evander lay down.)

We might have expected this motif to appeal to learned Hellenistic poets; one could compare Callimachus on Arcadia before and after Rhea gave birth to Zeus there (*Hymn* 1.18ff.) or Delphi before and after Apollo established his oracle (*Hymn* 4.90ff.). The Greek poets generally express this by 'Not yet . . . but still' (as in both passages just cited), the Romans by 'Where now . . . previously . . .'. Yet in an important way the Hellenistic world did not provide its poets with an adequate counterpart to Augustan Rome. Some Greek cities (above all Athens)⁹¹ offered extraordinarily rich documentation of their historical, religious and cultural traditions, but no present magnificence

⁹⁰ Similar passages (probably earlier than Propertius 4) are Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.347ff. (Evander conducting Aeneas over the site of future Rome) and Tibullus 2.5.23ff.

⁹¹ I wrote on 'Attica in Hellenistic Poetry' in *ZPE* 93 (1992) 1–15. Callimachus also made considerable use of a history of Argos (*Argolica*) by Agias and Dercylus.

in the third century BC, nor any great hopes for the future. Egyptian Alexandria under the first three Ptolemies offered both of these, but no long past history—even though Apollonius Rhodius in his *Foundation of Alexandria* (fr. 4 Powell) took the pre history of the region back to the time of the hero Perseus. Nonetheless it was possible for Propertius to give his aetiological poems an antiquarian flavour similar to that which Callimachus achieved by his use of Greek local chronicles.⁹² Consider, for example, the motif of bringing military help to a community under siege in Propertius 4.2.51–2:

tempore quo sociis venit Lycomedius armis
quoque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.

(‘At the time when Etruscans came with allied arms and crushed the Sabine forces of fierce Tatius.’)

This reminds me of an episode in the *Aetia* (*SH* 238.9ff.), where unfortunately the papyrus is so damaged that we can only guess at the context:⁹³

Ἐρχιάς] κοτ’ ἔκηδον ὁμόλακες . . .
καὶ Π]αιανιέων ἦν ὑπὸ πάντα δόρει,
τῆμος] Ἔποψ εὔτε σφιν . . .
ἦρ]ανος αἰχμηταῖς ἵκτο με[τ’ Ἐλλοπίοις

(‘Once neighbours were harassing the people of Erchia, and everything was subject to the spear of the Paeanians, at the time when Epps came to them as helper together with warriors from Ellopia.’)

Statues that receive strange treatment or paradoxical accoutrements are a favourite theme in the *Aetia*. Fr. 31b–e (vol. II, pp. 110–11 Pfeiffer) explains why the statue of Leucadian Diana carries on its head not a garland but a mortar. Originally the mortar was imposed as an insult, but the goddess indicated that she herself would prefer what seemed the less honorable headgear. Likewise the statue of Athena at Teuthis in Arcadia has a bandage around her thigh, recalling an episode in which the goddess was actually wounded (*Suppl. Hell.* 276). An altogether grimmer tale (fr. 187) told how some children

⁹² E.g., that of Xenomedes of Ceos, who is actually named in Callimachus’ text (fr. 75.54 Pf.) as the source of his Acontius and Cydippe story.

⁹³ Supplemented here according to a hypothesis put forward in *JPE* 93 (1992) 11–13, that the conflict may have been between the Attic demes of Erchia and Paecania.

in their play put a rope around the neck of Artemis' statue and pretended that they were strangling the goddess. Fr. 114 contains a dialogue between the statue of Delian Apollo and (perhaps) the poet.

In the lively and amusing Propertius 4.2 the statue of Vertumnus speaks throughout.⁹⁴ Relating his own personal history, the god comments on various etymologies of his name, slightly changing the form according to the etymology proposed.⁹⁵ At the end of the poem Vertumnus speaks of two statues; one a crude effort of maple wood, the other a more sophisticated work in bronze by a named craftsman, Mamurrius, who is blessed by the god (4.2.59–62):

Stipes acernus eram properanti falce dolatus,
ante Numam grata pauper in urbe deus.
at tibi, Mamurri, formae caelator aenae,
tellus artifices ne terat Oscan manus.

('I used to be a maple stump, notched by a hasty sickle, before Numa's time a poor god in a delightful city. But for you, Mamurrius who engraved my bronze statue, may the Oscan soil not chafe your artist's hands.')

These lines were surely inspired by Callimachus, fr. 100.1–2 (on a statue of Samian Hera):

οὐπω Σκέλμιον ἔργον ἐύξοον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τεθμόν
δηναιὸν γλυφάνων ἄξοος ἦσθα σανίς.

(Not yet the well-carved work of Scelmis, but according to ancient custom you were a plank not carved by chisels.)

Again, a crude, primitive statue is contrasted with a later, much more sophisticated, piece by a named craftsman.⁹⁶

Many consider 4.4 (*Tarpeia*) to be the most successful of Propertius' aetiological poems. Here he has combined his old preoccupation of love with a more substantial element of the promised 'religious rites, festivals and ancient place-names' (4.1.69), as the unchaste Vestal Virgin (soon to give her name to the 'Tarpeian,' later 'Capitoline' hill) prays that no Roman spear should spoil the good looks of her

⁹⁴ Admired by Ovid, as one can see from *Met.* 14.643ff.

⁹⁵ In general this seems clear, though it has often defeated Propertius' copyists. Playing with names and etymologies seems very Callimachean, though nothing closely similar has survived—one might mention fr. 723 (with Pfeiffer's notes) and fr. 201 (*Iambi*, lightly correcting the form of a name).

⁹⁶ The latter is perhaps the subject of Call. fr. 101.

country's enemy, Titus Tatius (35.6). At the same time Propertius adds a Latin example to a favorite pattern of Hellenistic literature, both prose and poetry:⁹⁷ a city or a fort is under siege, and the daughter of the defending commander falls in love with the leader of the attacking force. Using an intermediary (often her nurse) the girl offers to betray the citadel if he will marry her—it is an awkward point in almost all such stories that the enemy general, having agreed to the proposal, breaks his word and often kills the girl in a particularly cruel way.

In the course of Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα 21 Parthenius quotes two passages that he assigns to 'the poet of the *Foundation of Lesbos*.' There are quite good reasons⁹⁸ for identifying this poet as Apollonius Rhodius (fr. 12 Powell). As in the case of Alexander of Aetolia fr. 3.22 together with Prop. 1.20.22,⁹⁹ we may wonder whether Propertius had read a minor Hellenistic poet (Alex. Aet.) and a minor poem (the *Foundation of Lesbos*) by a greater figure (Ap. Rh.), or whether he had access to the collection which Parthenius made for Cornelius Gallus. The bitter irony with which Propertius describes the failure of Tarpeia's marriage hopes (4.4.89–91):

at Tatius (neque enim sceleri dedit hostis honorem)
'nube' ait, 'et regni scande cubile mei!'
dixit, et ingestis comitum super obruit armis.¹⁰⁰

(But Tatius (for the enemy did not honour treachery) said 'Marry me and ascend my royal bed!' With these words he overwhelmed her by piling upon her his comrades' weapons.)

distinctly recalls Apollonius on the death of Pisidice (fr. 12.19–21 Powell):

⁹⁷ Two examples can be found in Parthenius' Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα, 21 and 22. See Lightfoot's very detailed commentary (*Parthenius of Nicaea*, pp. 496–507). One source for Parth. 21 is said to be the third-century BC elegist Hermesianax (fr. 6 Powell).

⁹⁸ See Lightfoot (1999) p. 499.

⁹⁹ See p. 110 above.

¹⁰⁰ It is interesting that Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 17.6, quotes four Greek elegiac couplets by an obscure Simylus (*SH* 724), in which Tarpeia was killed much as in Prop. 4.4. It is not clear whether Simylus wrote before, or after, Propertius; similar uncertainty surrounds Butas, who wrote on Roman aetia in elegiacs (*SH* 234–36). As early as the third century BC, Callimachus had included Roman/Italian material in his *Aetia* (frs. 106–7 and 190 Pf.).

ἔνθ' ἥγ' αἰνότατον γάμον εἶσιδε Πηλεΐδαο
 Ἄργείων ὑπὸ χερσὶ δυσάμμορος, οἳ μιν ἔπεφνον
 πανσυδίῃ θαμινῇσιν ἀράσσοντες λιθάδεσσιν.

(Then the poor wretch saw a bitter kind of marriage with the son of Peleus, at the hands of the Argives, who killed her immediately by pelting her with hail upon hail of stones.)

I mentioned earlier that Propertius seems to owe more to the arrangement of Callimachus, *Aetia* books 3–4 (free-standing poems without connecting passages) than to that of 1–2 (integrated by the poet's conversation with the Muses). There is, however, one poem (9) in Propertius 4 that bears the hallmark of the earlier pair and can even be referred to particular episodes in *Aetia* 1. In both languages we find two linked aetia involving Heracles. The opening of Prop. 4.9 presents the hero, as we might expect, in grandiose and archaic mode (1–2):

Amphitryoniades qua tempestate iuencos
 egerat a stabulis, o Erythea, tuis

(At the time when Amphitryon's son had driven the cattle from your stalls, o Erythea.)

Notice the weighty patronymic, the old-fashioned 'qua tempestate' for 'quo tempore' and the second-person address (apostrophe) with 'o' to the island (or its eponymous nymph) Erythea.¹⁰¹ To our surprise we find that, in both poets, the hero is reduced to undignified extremities before eventually reasserting himself. In Propertius the cattle of Geryon have been stolen from Heracles by the monster Cacus, and, when the hero appeals to the priestess of the Bona Dea for a drink (a request that would not normally be refused to any fellow human being), he is rebuffed, because the cult of the goddess is confined to women. Appropriately enough (and in the best Alexandrian manner), when Hercules dedicates the Ara Maxima to commemorate the recovery of the cattle¹⁰² he balances the exclusion of men from the Bona Dea by forbidding his new cult to the female sex (67–70).

¹⁰¹ Propertius possibly remembers Euphorion fr. 52 Powell on the return of Heracles 'in a bronze bowl from cattle-rich Erythea' (χαλκείῃ ἀκάτῳ βουπληθέος ἐξ Ἐρυθείης).

¹⁰² Propertius describes the cattle of Geryon as Hercules' 'last labor' (17 'nostrae labor ultime clavae'); in this he differs from Euphorion, for whom Cerberus was δωδέκα λῳίσθος ἀέθλων (fr. 51.13 'last of all twelve labors').

In Callimachus fr. 24.10ff. Heracles is seeking food rather than drink—ostensibly for his young son Hyllus, but the hero's reputation for gluttony¹⁰³ suggests that he also has a personal interest:

εἴ τι κατωμαδῖης οὐλάδος ἐστὶν ἔσω
τόσσον ὅσον τ' ἀπὸ παιδὶ κακὴν βούπειναν ἐλάσσαι,
δός μοι· καὶ φιλῆς μνήσομ' ἀεὶ δόσιος.

(If you have anything in the pouch over your shoulder that would suffice to drive the dreadful hunger from my child, give it to me, and I will always remember your friendly gift.)

Thereafter the papyrus text begins to break up, but the reconstructed line 13 leaves no doubt that Heracles' request was abruptly refused: αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἀγρεῖον καὶ ἀμείλιχον ἐξεγέλασσε ('but he laughed a crude and pitiless laugh'). Consequently Heracles declared war upon Thiodamas and transported his Dryopian people.

The story of Thiodamas was preceded by a very similar tale set at Lindos on Rhodes. At or near the end of the latter stood an invocation of the hero, perhaps in the mouth of a Lindian priest rather than the poet (fr. 23.19–20):

χαῖρε βαρυσκίπων, ἐπίτακτα μὲν ἐξάκι δοιά,
ἐκ δ' αὐταγρεσίης πολλάκι πολλὰ καμών

(Hail to you of the heavy club, who performed twice six labours under instructions, and many on many occasions of your own initiative.)

This may be reflected in the final couplet of Prop. 4.9 (71–72):

Sancte pater, salve, cui iam favet aspera Iuno;
Sance,¹⁰⁴ velis libro dexter inesse meo.

(Hail, sanctified Father, whom cruel Juno now favours; Sancus, be pleased to be enclosed propitiously within my book.)

Propertius 4.9 seems to me among the most successful of the aetiological poems¹⁰⁵—Callimachus would have liked 'velis libro dexter

¹⁰³ Even on Olympus, after his deification, 'he still has that belly with which he once encountered Thiodamas ploughing' (ἔτι οἱ πάρα νηδὺς ἐκείνη / τῇ ποτ' ἀροτρίωντι συνήντετο Θειοδάμαντι, Call., *Hymn* 3.160–61).

¹⁰⁴ Line 74 'sic Sancum Tatiae composuere Cures' suggests that the Sabines ('Tatiae . . . Cures') identified Hercules with a local god of their own whom they called Sancus. Perhaps we should print 'Sance' in line 71 as well as 72.

¹⁰⁵ We have been discussing affinities between Prop. 4.9 and Callimachus' *Aetia*, but it is worth noting a very clear echo of the Fifth Hymn (line 102, μισθῶ τοῦτον

inesse meo.' Certainly I would place it above 4.10 on the Spolia Opima, a subject that held more apparent promise, but in which the three winners are treated so briefly that they hardly engage our interest. Only the lament for the lost power of Veii (lines 27–30) arouses sympathy.

Two poems that have not been discussed merit at least a brief consideration from a Callimachean angle. Prop. 4.8, a comic masterpiece, seems at first sight to have little or nothing in common with Callimachus. But what are we to make of lines 5–14 which describe a fertility rite at Lanuvium? These obviously bring the poem within the sphere of 'sacra', as predicted in 4.1.69; should we follow this train of thought any further? Callimachus fr. 178 Pf.¹⁰⁶ describes a sober and intellectual party (with only a modest amount of alcohol!), in which the poet questions a visitor from Icos about a religious ceremony performed on his home island. This rite involved a procession (fr. 178.26 καθόδου) featuring a girl (ibid. παρθένος or παῖς) who carries an onion (25 γήτειον) and some other item of food. The similarity may or may not have been close enough to stir the memory of Propertius' audience when they heard of his virgin at Lanuvium who carried food for the sacred snake (4.8.3–14). But it is amusing to contrast the high-minded banquet in which Callimachus happened—or was it divine prompting (fr. 178.8–10)?—to share a couch with a stranger who could assist his work, and the riotous party in which wine flowed freely and Propertius reclined with a disreputable female on either side (4.8.36 'quaeris discubitus? inter utramque fui').

The most famous poem in the *Aetia* told the story of a family that had survived and flourished for at least two centuries since a local chronicler (Xenomedes of Ceos, c. 450 BC) committed to writing the events that led to the original marriage of Acontius and Cydippe. Perhaps in the 260s BC, the descendants of Acontius still lived numerous and honored in Iulis (Call. fr. 75.50–2 ἐκ δὲ γάμου κείνοιο μέγ' οὔνομα μέλλε νέεσθαι / δὴ γὰρ ἔθ' ὑμέτερον φῶλον Ἀκοντίαδαι / πούλυ τι καὶ περίτιμον Ἰουλίδι ναιετάουσιν). The island of Ceos was at that time in the Ptolemaic sphere of influence, and the family may have

ἰδεῖν μεγάλῳ ['that man should see at a great price'] in Prop. 4.9.57 'magno Tiresias aspexit Pallada vates.' *Hymn* 5.5ff. are also reflected in Prop. 2.18.9–10.

¹⁰⁶ Possibly from *Aetia* 2; see G. Massimilla, *Callimaco, Aitia: Libri Primo e Secondo* (Pisa 1996) p. 400.

commissioned Callimachus to celebrate their history.¹⁰⁷ The same (*mutatis mutandis*) is probably true of the most admired poem in Propertius 4 (11), which looks like a commissioned piece, in honor of the life and family of Cornelia, step-daughter to the emperor Augustus. Although not strictly aetiological, it celebrates a family with a great Republican past, close links to the current rulers of Rome, and high hopes for the future.

I will end by bringing in one more Hellenistic poet, Lycophron of Chalcis. The obscurity of his *Alexandra* (an alternative name for the Trojan princess Cassandra) was as notorious in antiquity as in modern times. It cannot well be called a tragedy—rather an immense monologue in which a messenger reports to king Priam the riddling utterances in which Alexandra has been foretelling the future of Greeks and Trojans after the end of the war. Considerable emphasis is given to Italy, and in lines 1226ff. a remarkable passage prophesies for the Romans ‘power and rule over land and sea’ (1229 γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκηπτρα καὶ μοναρχίαν). This obviously raises a question whether a poet of the third century BC (Lycophron’s traditional date) could have possessed such political foresight. The explanation may be that a third-century work has undergone later interpolation.¹⁰⁸ My concern here is with Propertius’ allusion to the poem in a passage that itself has suffered corruption and (in the opinion of many scholars) disarrangement of couplets. This is not the place to discuss all the problems, but here is the passage with text and punctuation as I would understand it (4.1.49–54):¹⁰⁹

si modo Avernalis tremulae cortina Sibyllae
dixit Aventino rura pianda Remo,
aut si Pergameae sero rata carmina vatis
longaevum ad Priami vera fuere caput,
vertite equum, Danaï! male vincitis; Ilia tellus
vivet, et huic cineri Iuppiter arma dabit.

(‘If only the Avernian¹¹⁰ tripod of the trembling Sibyl spoke of the countryside to be purified by Remus of the Aventine, or if the utterances of the Trojan princess to aged Priam have proved true, confirmed

¹⁰⁷ Suggested in *ZPE* 93 (1992) 6 n. 30.

¹⁰⁸ See West (1984) 127–51.

¹⁰⁹ Incidentally, this does not require any transposition of the manuscript’s order of lines.

¹¹⁰ I.e., Cumaean.

long afterwards, turn back your horse, Greeks! Your victory is in vain;
the Ilian land will live, and Jupiter will give arms to these ashes.')

I would take 'vertite' (53) to represent Propertius addressing the Greeks across the centuries; their (temporary) triumph is of no avail, because Troy will be reborn in Rome.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ This is also a theme of Tibullus 2.5, which has much in common with Propertius 4.1.

CHAPTER SIX

PROPERTIUS AND THE NEOTERICIS

Peter Knox

Convenience trumps historical precision in sanctioning the continuing use of the term “neoteric” to refer to a group of poets active in the 50s to early 30s BC. When Cicero wrote to Atticus (50 BC) about his return to Italy, he was certainly referring to persons who would have been recognizable as individuals or representatives of a general trend:¹ *itabelle nobis flauit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites*—*hunc σπονδειάζοντα si cui uoles τῶν νεωτέρων pro tuo uendito* (“with a fair wind behind us, ‘Softly, softly, from Epirus blew the Onchesmitic breeze.’ There! You can commend that as your own to one or other of the *neoteroi*.” *Att.* 7.2.1). This is true, even though the term *neoteroi* itself is “a purely temporal designation,” distinguishing the practices of certain poets contemporary with Cicero from a previous generation.² Even critics who are not willing to conceive of these poets as a group generally concede that Cicero identifies certain stylistic traits as common to this generation, in this case a partiality for spondaic lines shared with Greek poets of the Hellenistic period.³ It is certainly not possible to identify the specific poets Cicero had in mind, if indeed he was thinking of particular poets, rather than a general fashion. It would, of course, be easiest for us to assume that he was indeed targeting Catullus and the poets we find mentioned in his verse—Cinna, Calvus, Furius Bibaculus—but there were other poets active about this time and it would be imprudent to be too restrictive.⁴

¹ Thus, Lyne (1978) 167–68, who generally bucks current trends by seeing the neoterics as a more cohesive group. For earlier discussions of Propertius’ relationship to this immediately preceding generation of Roman poets, see, e.g., Sullivan (1976) 116–21, Luck (1969) 47–56, Tränkle (1960) 22–30.

² Courtney (1993) 189. For the sense of the term, cf. Cameron (1980) 117–18.

³ For the practice of Catullus and his contemporaries, see Ross (1969) 130–31, Platnauer (1951) 38–39, Lyne (1978a) 15–16. For Callimachus and the Hellenistic poets, see Hollis (1990) 17–19.

⁴ Cf. Lightfoot (1999) 55–56.

Likewise, we should be cautious in setting too narrow chronological limits on the poetry that we may conveniently designate as neoteric. Catullus was probably dead already in 50, when Cicero penned his letter. If his reference to the practices of “*poetae noui*” or “new poets” in *Orat.* 161 has the same general point of reference, then presumably there were still such poets active in 46, even though Calvus too was now deceased.⁵ In reviewing the relationship of Propertius with his predecessors, therefore, every assertion must be accompanied by at least one *caveat*; the surest place to begin therefore is with the poet’s own words.

Propertius on his Predecessors

The Roman poets tended to write literary criticism by a string of names.⁶ So, in the poem that stands at the end of Book 2 as we have it,⁷ Propertius describes his literary heritage by reference first to Greek models in Hellenistic elegy, Callimachus and Philetas,⁸ then to his predecessors in Latin. First Virgil, to whose influence he devotes twenty-two lines. Then, in a studied composition of names, each coming at the end of the hexameter, the neoteric poets whom Propertius singles out for their influence on his love poetry (2.34b.85–94):

haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro,
 Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma suae;
 haec quoque lasciui cantarunt scripta Catulli,
 Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena;
 haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calui,
 cum caneret miseræ funera Quintiliae.

⁵ The references to Calvus in Cic. *Fam.* 15.21.4 (47 BC) and *Brut.* 279, 283 make it clear that he was already dead then.

⁶ This is particularly true of Ovid, as Tarrant (2002) 15 notes: “Ovid’s characteristic literary-historical gesture is the list”; cf. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.15.9–30. Other examples include Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.40ff., *Epist.* 2.1.50ff., Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.252ff. The practice is ultimately indebted to the canons of poets composed by Hellenistic scholars, on which see Fraser (1972) I.456; Lightfoot (1999) 89–91.

⁷ The consensus among editors of Propertius, with some notable exceptions, is returning to the formerly discredited view, championed by Lachmann, that Book 2 is a conflation of two books. It is endorsed by Goold (1990) 115 and recently has been convincingly argued by Heyworth (1995) and Lyne (1998); cf. Günther (1997a) 6–10. Not every critic is convinced, however; see, e.g., Butrica (1996), Holzberg (2001) 37–38.

⁸ See Hollis p. 110ff. in this vol.

et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus
 mortuus inferna uulnera lauit aqua!
 Cynthia quin uiuet⁹ uersu laudata Properti,
 hos inter si me ponere Fama uolet.

Such themes did Varro also sport with, his tale of Jason ended, Varro, the brightest flame of his Leucadia; such themes the verse of wanton Catullus also sang, which made Lesbia better known than Helen herself; such passion also the pages of learned Calvus confessed, when he sang of the death of hapless Quintilia. And in these recent days how many wounds has Gallus, dead for love of fair Lycoris, laved in the waters of the world below! Yes, Cynthia glorified in the pages of Propertius shall live, if Fame consent to rank me with bards like these.

Some analogies for the way in which Propertius read the other neoterics may perhaps be inferred from the uses to which he put Catullus, who figures as the second poet in his catalogue.

The most obvious point of contact with Catullus is to be found in the Lesbia poems, which are explicitly acknowledged here in 2.34 and in his only other direct reference (2.25.1–4):

Cynthia nata meo, pulcherrima cura, dolori,
 excludi quoniam sors mea saepe uehit,
 ista meis fiet notissima forma libellis,
 Calue, tua uenia, pace, Catulle, tua.

Cynthia, born to cause me pain (though comeliest of sorrows) since my lot oft brings exclusion, my books shall make your beauty renowned beyond all others, begging your pardon, Calvus, and by your leave, Catullus.

The influence of the Lesbia poems is prominent throughout the surviving first two books.¹⁰ Critics have focused not only on the degree to which Propertius learned from his predecessor how to craft an individual identity within the framework of a love affair, but also on the means of expressing this identity through allusion to myth. The importance of Catullus' longer elegy, Poem 68, in which he explores

⁹ The text follows Goid (1990) and Hanslik (1979) in accepting Barber's *uiuet* for *etiam* of the paradosis; cf. Günther (1997a) 102.

¹⁰ Sullivan (1976) 116: "Propertius learnt from the Neoterics, from Catullus and his like-minded contemporaries (e.g., Valerius Cato, Calvus, Cinna, and Varro), the freedom to indulge in autobiography, in the analysis of his relationship with Cynthia, particularly in his first book." On Catullus as an intertext in Book 1, see now Miller (2004) 91–93.

the ramifications of his relationship through the myth of Laodamia and Protesilaus, looms large in tracing this strand of influence.¹¹

But it would be a mistake to assume that Propertius limited his interest in Catullus to the poems on Lesbia. Indeed, in one of his most highly admired elegies on Cynthia, Propertius shows himself a close and imaginative reader of Catullus' miniature epic, Poem 64. The third elegy of the first book opens with the drunken poet returning from a night of banqueting to find Cynthia sleeping alone. She seems to him like a figure out of myth (1.3.1–2):

Qualis Thesea iacuit cedente carina
 languida desertis Cnosia litoribus . . .

Like the maid of Cnossos as in a swoon she lay on the deserted shore
 when Theseus' ship sailed away . . .

The evocation of Catullus has not escaped commentators,¹² and Catullan echoes have been detected throughout the poem.¹³ Many of the other most likely intertexts for this poem can only be reconstructed conjecturally, for the reference to Andromede, for instance, in the following couplet, probably would trigger a more precise literary reference for Propertius' first readers. So too the allusion to Io in lines 19–20 would probably recall another neoteric text, the miniature epic by Calvus. But a careful reading of individual passages unmistakably reveals the complete absorption of the neoteric style by Propertius and betrays the influence of Catullus and his contemporaries (19–26):

sed sic intentis haerebam fixus ocellis,
 Argus ut ignotis cornibus Inachidos.
 et modo soluebam nostra de fronte corollas
 ponebamque tuis, Cynthia, temporibus;
 et modo gaudebam lapsos formare capillos;
 nunc furtiua cauis poma dabam manibus:
 omnia quae ingrato largibar munera somno,
 munera de prono saepe uoluta sinu.

But I remained rooted with eyes intent upon her, like those of Argus
 upon the strange horns of Inachus' child. And now I was taking off
 the garlands from my brow and arranging them about your temples,

¹¹ Cf. Lyne (1998a), Fowler (2000).

¹² See especially Fedeli (1980) 110–11, Harrison (1994).

¹³ E.g., Curran (1966) 196–97.

Cynthia; and now I took pleasure in building up your fallen locks, then with hollowed palms I stealthily gave you apples. But all these gifts I was bestowing on ungrateful sleep, gifts which repeatedly rolled down from your lap.

Elaborate combinations of sound patterns, together with word choice and metrical coloration, suggest a Catullan flavor.¹⁴ As with the Lesbia poems, the depth of Catullus' influence can be gauged from the seriousness of Propertius' engagement with the substance of his predecessor's work rather than large accretions of specific verbal allusions. If we infer that Propertius' allusions to the other neoteric poets followed the same pattern, their influence is surely great, though this will inevitably remain a matter of speculation rather than assertion.

Varro and Calvus

Of the impact of Varro of Atax on Propertius little has been said, because we know so little about him. It must be significant that Varro heads this list, but the how of it we can scarcely judge. He surely belongs in the constellation of neoteric poets, even though one of his works, an epic *Bellum Sequanicum* on Caesar's campaign of 58 BC, is inconsistent with the type of poetry favored by them.¹⁵ What little we know of his other works suggests a profound engagement with the Hellenistic poets who mattered most to the neoterics, but it is his love poetry that Propertius singles out as an important influence. Varro's poetry about a woman he called Leucadia, a work probably of the late forties composed after his translation of

¹⁴ See the acute and sensitive analysis of this passage by Ross (1975) 54–56. Additional intertexts in this poem are to be found in the visual arts (cf. Wlosok 1967, 335–38; Fedeli 1980, 112) and New Comedy (cf. Hubbard 1975, 20–21; Schulz-Vanheyden 1969, 156–59; Harrison 1994).

¹⁵ This circumstance leads Courtney (1993) 237, *inter al.*, to see no connection: "Varro writes only in hexameters, did not compose a miniature epic, and has no known connection with any of the 'neoteric' poets;" cf. also Crowther (1987). But Lightfoot (1999) 69–70 is surely right to insist upon the neoteric affiliations of Varro's other works, including the translation of Apollonius of Rhodes and two didactic poems, *Chorographia* drawing on Alexander of Ephesus and *Ephemeris* utilizing Aratus' *Phaenomena*. As noted by Clausen (1987) 5, St. Jerome's comment that Varro did not learn Greek until he was thirty-five years old (i.e., 47 BC), suggests that Varro's neoteric activity was a later development in his career.

Apollonius,¹⁶ is completely unknown to us.¹⁷ It is surmised that Varro chose this pseudonym, like Catullus' Lesbia, to recall Sappho and the story about her fatal leap from the promontory on Leucas.¹⁸

In all likelihood, however, as with Catullus, so Varro's influence is not limited to his love poems. Propertius' reference to the *Argonautica* perhaps suggests that this poem too had its impact. This narrative poem was much admired by contemporaries, and we may suspect that it lies behind at least some contemporary references to the myth.¹⁹ Propertius makes frequent use of Medea as an exemplum in the second book. In the programmatic opening poem, he asserts the primacy of love and love poetry—*laus in amore mori* ("to die in love is glory," 2.1.47)—even if it means enduring the post-Argonautic Medea: *siue / Colchis Iolciacis urat aena focis* ("or though the Colchian woman heat for me her cauldron upon the hearths of Iolcos," 2.1.53–54). The opening half-line is virtually transliterated from the Greek: the antonomasia, *Colchis* for Medea, is first found in Latin poetry in Horace (*Epod.* 16.58), but that is unlikely to be the first instance.²⁰ Propertius is particularly fond of it,²¹ while the adjective *Iolciacus* is attested elsewhere only in the *Ciris* (377), which was heavily influenced by the neoterics, and Ovid, *Met.* 7.158, where the influence of Varro may be prominent in his account of Medea.²² Medea as an exemplum in Propertius' poetry may well be the Medea of Varro's *Argonautica*, which would lend programmatic significance to her appearance in Propertius' opening address to Lynceus on the power of Amor: *Colchis et ignotum nempe secuta uirum* ("and it was of

¹⁶ On the chronology of Varro's works, cf. Hofmann (1928).

¹⁷ No fragments survive, and the only other testimony is Ovid, *Trist.* 2.439–40 *is quoque, Phasiacas Argon qui duxit in undas, / non potuit Veneris furta tacere suae*. Elsewhere, when Ovid mentions Varro, it is his *Argonautica* that he praises: cf. *Am.* 1.15.21–22, *Ars* 3.335–336. In Ovid's catalogue of love poets at *Am.* 3.9.61ff., Varro's name is prominent only by its absence; cf. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.15.21–22.

¹⁸ See Knox (1995) on *Her.* 15.161–72. Parthenius wrote a *Leucadiae*, but its subject is not known; cf. Lightfoot (1999) 156–57.

¹⁹ On the importance of Varro for Virgil, for example, see Nelis (2001) 3, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, s.v. 'Varrone, Publio Terenzio', Thomas 1986, 197–98 [= (1999) 139–40].

²⁰ In Greek it is as old as Euripides, *Med.* 132.

²¹ Cf. 2.21.11, 2.34.8, 3.11.9.

²² Ovid's fascination with Medea took many forms, and he clearly drew on many sources. The state of the evidence does not allow us to draw firm conclusions, but it is highly likely that in *Met.* 7.7–158 Varro was an influence. *Iolciacus* is not attested in Greek.

course an unknown lover that the girl from Colchis followed," 2.34.8). Nor is it certain that Propertius used only the story of Jason and Medea from Varro's *Argonautica*. 1.20, "in some ways certainly the oddest piece in all Augustan elegy,"²³ is a poem of advice, addressed to Gallus,²⁴ using the story of Hylas as an exemplum. *Cui non dictus Hylas puer*: amidst much speculation about antecedents, there is the virtual certainty that Varro included the story in his version of the *Argonautica*. It is a plausible inference that Cornelius Gallus made some use of the story in his elegies,²⁵ but if he did, it is almost certain that an important intertext for him, as for Propertius, was Varro's translation.

We are in no better position to evaluate the contributions of Licinius Calvus, third in this catalogue of predecessors in love poetry. Calvus is linked more firmly with the neoterics through his association with Catullus, and his literary production is often taken as paradigmatic of a career in poetry during the period: satirical epigrams in a variety of meters, epithalamia, and the influential miniature epic *Io*.²⁶ This is the background signaled in the epithet *doctus*—more commonly applied to Catullus²⁷—that here probably alludes to the Calvus' miniature epic, while the emphasis is laid on his love poetry.

As in his acknowledgement of Varro, the emphasis on Calvus' love poetry does not obscure recognition of the importance of the narrative verse. The *Io* was much admired by his contemporaries and later neoterics, to judge from surviving testimonials, including allusions. The most notable are echoes of a hexameter, cited by Vergil's ancient commentator:²⁸

a uirgo infelix, herbis pascere amaris

²³ Ross (1975) 75.

²⁴ That the poet is the addressee is still disputed, but seems highly likely; cf. Ross (1975) 82–4, Cairns (1983) 83–84, Miller (2004) 73–83. Reservations remain: e.g., Syme (1978) 99–103, Citroni (1995) 381 and 418–19.

²⁵ Ross (1975) 80–81.

²⁶ On Calvus, see Lyne (1978b) 177–79, arguing that Calvus' love poetry was limited to an epicedion for Quintilia. On the influence of the *Io*, see Lyne (1978a) 45, Thomas (1981).

²⁷ Cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.9.62, [Tib.] 3.6.41. On the associations of the epithet for Roman poets, cf. Fordyce (1961) on Cat. 35. 17, Kroll (1924) 37, Cairns (1979) 11–12. Martial repeatedly uses it of Catullus: 7.99.7, 8.73.8, 14.100.1, 14.152.1.

²⁸ DServ. *Ecl.* 6.47 = Calvus, fr. 9.

The line is also acknowledged by Ovid in his rendition of Io's story in the *Metamorphoses* (1.632):

frondibus arboreis et amara pascitur herba

Ovid's indebtedness to Calvus in this passage is generally noted,²⁹ as is the likelihood that there are other allusions to Calvus' lost poem that go unrecognized. Few scholars have noted, however, that Propertius too adapts this famous line in an elegy of the second book lamenting Cynthia's obligations (ten nights of abstinence) to the goddess Isis. Propertius takes advantage of the identification of the goddess with Io to refer to her former love of Jupiter and her transformation into a cow (2.33a.11–12):

a quotiens quernis laesisti frondibus ora,
mandisti et stabulis arbuta pasta tuis!

Ah, how often did you chafe your mouth with oak leaves and chew in your stall the arbuta you had fed on!

The allusion to Calvus' poem summons up the narrative of Io's love affair and despair as an intertext for Propertius' first readers in ways that we can only estimate. Io, in her role as Isis, has no pity on Propertius deprived of Cynthia's company, and is revealed as more unfeeling in counterpoint to Calvus' representation of her own sufferings in love.

This poem forms a pendant with 2.28, where Cynthia's illness is the background for the requirement that she fulfill an oath to Isis.³⁰ In that poem, too, Propertius evokes the background of mythology through allusion to the miniature epics of his neoteric predecessors. A possible explanation for Cynthia's illness is that she has aroused the wrath of a goddess (2.28.9–12):

num sibi collatam doluit Venus? illa peraeque
prae se formosis invidiosa dea est.
an contempta tibi Iunonis planta Pelasgae?
Palladis aut oculos ausa negare bonos?

Was Venus annoyed that you were compared with her? She is a goddess jealous of all alike whose beauty outshines her own. Have you

²⁹ Cf. Bömer (1969) on *Met.* 1.632 and 714. On Calvus, fr. 9, see Thomas (1979) 337–39 (= Thomas 1999, 297–99).

³⁰ See the discussion of this poem by Hubbard (1975) 47–58.

slighted the gait of Argive Juno, or ventured to deem the eyes of Pallas unlovely?

The first couplet alludes to the story of Zmyrna, who was inflicted with an incestuous passion for her father because she made unfavorable comparisons of herself with Aphrodite. It is likely that it contains an allusion to the famous narrative poem by Helvius Cinna. The two following questions allude to similar tales of passion and metamorphosis, Meropis and Scylla, which were known to Propertius at least through Hellenistic versions, if they had not already been adapted by Roman poets.³¹ Io also figures among the mythological exempla used by Propertius to illustrate his situation (17–18):

Io uersa caput primos muguerat annos:
nunc dea, quae Nili flumina uacca bibit.

Io in her early years lowed, her head transformed: now she who as a cow drank the Nile's waters is a goddess.

In his catalogue of neoteric antecedents, Propertius highlights their love poetry, while at the same time acknowledging the relevance of their narrative works.

In citing Calvus' love poetry at the conclusion of Book 2, Propertius refers to an elegy on the death of Quintilia, one of the women in Calvus' life and poetry. The poem (or poems)³² is acknowledged in Catullus in 96:

si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumue sepulchris
accidere a nostro, Calue, dolore potest,
quo desiderio ueteres renouamus amores
atque olim missas flemus amicitias,
certe non tanto mors immatura dolori est
Quintiliae, quantum gaudet amore tuo.

If the silent grave can receive any pleasure, or sweetness at all from our grief, Calvus, the grief and regret with which we make our old

³¹ See Knox (1986).

³² It is almost universally assumed that Propertius is referring to a single poem, an epicedion for Quintilia. She is often identified as his wife, on the assumption that this poem was modeled on Parthenius' *Arete*: for this interpretation, Fraenkel (1956) has been particularly influential. But this is far from certain, and it is impossible to specify the relationship between Calvus and Parthenius: cf. Tränkle (1967) 93–95, Lightfoot (1999) 71–72, Courtney (1993) 207–9. Other references to Calvus as a love poet (e.g., Prop. 2.25.4, Plin. *Epist.* 5.3.5) lend themselves to the suggestion that he devoted more than one poem to Quintilia.

loves live again, and weep for long-lost friendships, surely Quintilia feels less sorrow for her too early death, than pleasure from your love.

Two fragments only survive, cited by later grammarians to illustrate a preciosity of style, Calvus' use of *cinis* in the feminine. The two fragments, a pentameter and part of a hexameter, have been plausibly joined by E. Courtney (fr. 15–16):

cum iam fulua cinis fuero <condarque sepulchro>,
forsitan hoc etiam gaudeat ipsa cinis.

'When I have been turned into ashes and am buried in my tomb, perhaps my very ashes shall feel pleasure even at this.'

Catullus' poem seems to play off of the pentameter in lines 5–6, and there may also be an allusion to Calvus' love elegy in Propertius. Calvus' lines have been plausibly attributed to Quintilia's dying words, addressing her *mandata* addressed either to Calvus or to someone else to be transmitted to him. A similar scenario is developed in Prop. 2.13, which may well have been the opening poem of his third book.³³ There Propertius also imagines himself reduced to ashes (31–32),

deinde, ubi suppositus cinerem me fecerit ardor,
accipiat Manes paruula testa meos . . .

Then, when the fire beneath has turned me into ash, let a little jar receive my ghost . . .

And the elegy concludes with an address to his Cynthia (51–58),

tu tamen amisso non numquam flebis amico:
fas est praeteritos semper amare uiros.
testis, cui niueum quondam percussit Adonem
uenantem Idalio uertice durus aper;
illis formosum lauuisse paludibus, illic
diceris³⁴ effusa tu, Venus, isse coma.
sed frustra mutos reuocabis, Cynthia, Manes:
nam mea quid poterunt ossa minuta loqui?

Yet you will sometimes weep the friend you have lost; it is a duty to love forever a mate who is dead and gone. Be she my witness, whose snow-white Adonis, as he hunted upon Idalian peaks, was struck down by a cruel boar. In waters there is Venus said to have laved her

³³ Thus Heyworth (1995), though this is, of course, speculative and other scenarios are possible, e.g., the case made by Lyne (1998c) for 2.12 as opening the book.

³⁴ For this typology (*diceris*) in signaling an allusion, cf. Hinds (1998) 2–5.

beauteous lover, there to have gone about with dishevelled hair. But in vain, Cynthia, will you call back my silent shade: for what answer shall my crumbled bones be able to make?

Prop. 2.13 is an important programmatic poem, perhaps, as many have concluded, the opening poem of Propertius' third book before it was amalgamated with his second. If that is the case then it is possible that Calvus, who is evoked by name in the conclusion of the book, is also present as an intertext at its beginning.

Virgil

In introducing his catalogue of neoteric predecessors Propertius gives pride of place to Virgil, but not to the poet of the *Aeneid*, at least not in terms of Virgil's contribution to his own development.³⁵ He acknowledges the forthcoming epic, of course, in a tribute that doubles as a *recusatio* (2.34.59–66):

mi libet hesternis posito languere corollis,
 quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus;
 Actia Vergilio custodis litora Phoebi,
 Caesaris et fortis dicere posse rates,
 qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitāt arma
 iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus.
 cedite, Romani scriptores, cedite, Grai!
 nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.

My pleasure is to loll amid the garlands of yesterday, for the god of unerring aim has pierced me to the bone; that of Virgil is to be able to sing the Actian shores o'er which Apollo watches, and the brave fleet of Caesar; even now he is stirring to life the arms of Trojan Aeneas and the walls he founded on Lavine shores. Make way, ye Roman writers, make way, ye Greeks! Something greater than the *Iliad* is coming to birth.

But while Propertius acknowledges the epic and the didactic *Georgics* as well,³⁶ it is the *Eclogues* that he cites as a precedent for the love poetry of his first three books (2.34.67–84):

tu canis umbrosi subter pineta Galaesi
 Thyrsin et attritis Daphnin harundinibus,

³⁵ On Virgil as a neoteric poet, cf. Clausen (1987) 1–14.

³⁶ For Propertius' intertextuality in this passage, cf. Thomas (1996) 241–46 (= 1999, 263–66).

utque decem possint corrumpere mala puellas
 missus et impressis haedus ab uberibus.
 felix, qui uilis pomis mercaris amores!
 huic licet ingratae Tityrus ipse canat.
 felix intactum Corydon qui temptat Alexin
 agricolae domini carpere delicias!
 quamuis ille sua lassus requiescat auena,
 laudatur facilis inter Hamadryadas.³⁷
 non tamen haec ulli uenient ingrata legenti,
 siue in amore rudis siue peritus erit.
 nec minor hic animis, ut sit minor ore, canorus
 anseris indocto carmine cessit olor.

You sing, beneath the pinewoods of shady Galaesus, of Thyrsis and Daphnis with his well-worn pipes, and how ten apples or the gift of a kid fresh from the udder of its dam may win the love of girls. Happy you, who can buy your love cheaply with apples! To her, unkind though she be, even Tityrus may sing. Happy is Corydon, who essays to steal Alexis yet unwon, the darling of his rustic master. Though the poet is weary and rests from his piping, he is praised by the compliant nymphs. But these songs of his will not fail to please any reader, be he a tiro in love or one accomplished. And the melodious swan, displaying no lesser genius in this lesser style, has not disgraced himself with the tuneless strain of a goose.

Clear echoes of the *Eclogues* in Propertius are not as obvious as in the work of his near contemporary, Tibullus.³⁸ This is perhaps also attributable to the densely allusive character of the *Eclogues* as well, where Theocritus, Callimachus, and the Roman neoterics are all active intertexts. Part of the influence that Propertius acknowledges in 2.34 will be the allusive technique exemplified in Virgil's pastoral poetry, some aspects of which are on display in Propertius' love elegies. In 1.18, for example, set in the solitude of the countryside, the poet laments Cynthia's inexplicable coolness (1–4):

³⁷ Several critics have argued that lines 77–80, which follow here in the manuscripts, should be transposed to follow 66. The passage is printed as it appears in Goold (1990).

³⁸ Ovid represents Propertius as following Tibullus (*Trist.* 4.10.53) *successor fuit hic* (sc. Tibullus) *tibi, Galle, Propertius illi*. This chronology is not supported by most modern scholars, but see now Knox (2005). Jacoby (1905) 79–80 suggests that Tibullus picked up on the pastoral elements in Gallus, while Propertius focused on the mythological: see Cairns (1979) 228 and (1986) 47–59. The influence of the *Eclogues* has not infrequently been noted, e.g., by Wilamowitz (1924) I 237; Alfonsi (1946) 18, n. 1; Bright (1978) 11, but their full extent and significance await detailed explication.

haec certe deserta loca et taciturna querenti,
 et uacuum Zephyri possidet aura nemus.
 hic licet occultos proferre impune dolores,
 si modo sola queant saxa tenere fidem.

This at least is a lonely spot that will keep silent about my grievances, and the zephyr's breath holds sway over the empty grove. Here I can freely pour forth my secret anguish, unless the lonely rocks fail to keep faith.

The setting recalls Virgil's Second Eclogue, in which the unhappy Corydon retires to the woods and mountains (3–5):

tantum inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos
 adsidue ueniebat. ibi haec incondita solus
 montibus et siluis studio iactabat inani.

'He could but come continually among the thick, shady-topped beeches. There alone in idle passion he would call out these artless words to the hills and woods.'

The complex pattern of allusions includes not only the complaint of Theocritus' Polyphemus (*Id.* 11), but echoes of Callimachus and other Hellenistic poets.³⁹

Among the other influences detectable in this passage is Cornelius Gallus, whom Virgil also represents alone in the wild, afflicted by love (*Ecl.* 10.13–15):

illum etiam lauri, etiam fleuere myricae,
 pinifer illum etiam sola sub rupe iacentem
 Maenalus et gelidi fleuerunt saxa Lycae.

'Even the laurels wept for him, even the Tamarisks; even Maenalus with his crown of pines wept for him as he lay beneath a lonely cliff, and the rocks of chill Lycaeus.

It thus appears that, like Virgil, Propertius has marshaled a wide array of textual resources in representing this moment. If the pastoral setting of this elegy suggests a debt to Virgil, that debt is also marked in the manner of composition, for with a gesture to Virgil, Propertius also incorporates one of the most important intertexts in

³⁹ E.g., Phanocles, fr. 1.1–2; cf. Clausen (1994) 61–63. For the intertextual background of this Eclogue, see, Du Quesnay (1979) and Kenney (1983) 44–52, with reference to earlier works.

the *Eclogues*, Callimachus' *Aetia*. Propertius' complaint culminates in a cry of despair (21–22):

a quotiens teneras resonant mea uerba sub umbras,
scribitur et teneris Cynthia corticibus!

Ah, how often my words echo beneath your shade, and Cynthia's name is written on your delicate bark!

The accident of transmission allows us to correlate this couplet with a fragment of Callimachus, in his narrative account of Acontius and Cydippe (*Aetia*, fr. 73 Pf.):

ἀλλ' ἐνὶ δῇ φλοιοῖσι κεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε
γράμματα, Κυδίππην ὅσσ' ἐρέουσι καλήν.

But on your bark may you bear so many carved letters as will say that Cydippe is beautiful.

Propertius has translated the impersonal narrative of Callimachus to a situation of personal emotion in subjective elegy.⁴⁰ In so doing, he had before him the example of the *Eclogues*, where Virgil represents Gallus as an Acontius figure (*Ecl.* 10.52–54):⁴¹

certum est in siluis inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, amores.

I am resolved to suffer in the woods among the lairs of wild beasts and to engrave my love poetry on the delicate trees: as they grow, so too will you, my loves.

It is likely that in these lines Virgil is acknowledging a similar transference of the Callimachean motif by Gallus in his elegies.⁴²

There can be no certainty in such matters, but it is a reasonable inference to be drawn from the pastoral context in which Propertius situates his adaptation that Propertius is acknowledging his other intertexts (Callimachus, Gallus) through allusion to Virgil's *Eclogues*. Throughout his first two books, Propertius shows himself to be acutely engaged with the reception of Gallus, both directly and mediated through the neoteric poetry of Virgil's *Eclogues*. In the third book

⁴⁰ The fundamental discussion is still Cairns (1969).

⁴¹ There may also be an allusion to the story of Acontius in *Ecl.* 1.4–5 *tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra / formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas*; cf. Clausen (1994) 37.

⁴² Ross (1975) 73.

this strand of influence has run its course, as Propertius is increasingly engaged with Virgil's postneoteric poetry, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, and with the Hellenistic antecedents, Callimachus and Philetas.⁴³

Gallus

Surely the most important neoteric influence on Propertius was Cornelius Gallus, our knowledge of whose works is in almost perfectly inverse proportion to the volume of writing on them.⁴⁴ The temptation for scholars to speculate is irresistible and should not be resisted, because of Gallus' obvious importance to Roman literary tradition. What little we know of Gallus as a historical figure and poet must be supplemented by what we can infer from the importance attached to his name by Virgil and Propertius.⁴⁵ With more or less conviction, critics have established significant intertextual connections to Gallus' elegies throughout the first book. The opening poem highlights the theme of Propertius' submission to love by reference to the myth of Milanion and Atalanta (1.1.9–16):

Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores
 saeuitiam durae contudit Iasidos.
 nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,
 rursus in hirsutas ibat et ille feras;
 ille etiam Hylaei percussus uulnere rami
 saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit.
 ergo uelocem potuit domuisse puellam:
 tantum in amore fides et benefacta ualent.

Tullus, it was by shrinking from no hardship that Milanion broke down the cruelty of harsh Atalanta. For now he wandered distraught in the glens of Parthenius, and now he would go to confront shaggy wild beasts. He was also dealt a wound from the club Hylaeus bore, and on the rocks of Arcadia he moaned in pain. Thus he was able to

⁴³ Ross (1975) 107–30, Fedeli (1985b) 33, Thomas (1983) 101–3 (= Thomas 1999, 82–85); Cairns (2003).

⁴⁴ The early explorations by Skutsch (1901) and (1906) focused on the rather sterile question of the authorship of the *Ciris*. His unpersuasive arguments for Gallus' authorship have recently been revived unconvincingly by Gall (1999).

⁴⁵ For general accounts of Gallus, Boucher (1966) is still useful, as is Crowther (1983). The fragments are edited in Blänsdorf (1995) and with commentary by Courtney (1993) 259–70, which uniquely includes Virg. *Ecl.* 10.42–63 as fragment 3. For recent discussions with bibliography, see Fantham (1996) 56–60, Gall (1999) 141–245, Holzberg (2001) 31–35.

subdue the swift-footed girl: such power in love have devotion and service.

Close verbal analysis of the peculiarities of this passage have led scholars to suspect that Propertius is alluding to an earlier text, with Gallus as the most plausible possibility.⁴⁶ Similar analyses have made it probable that for Propertius' first readers, Gallus was an important intertext at least in 1.8.⁴⁷

Gallus caps the list of neoteric antecedents in 2.34, in a couplet that probably echoes words from his own verse, though this is a scholarly reconstruction only, because so little of his work survives (91–92).⁴⁸

et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus
mortuus inferna uulnera lauit aqua

This couplet has been compared with Euphorion, fr. 43 Powell *Κόκνυτός τοι μούνος ἄφ' ἔλκεα νίψεν Ἀδονιν* and it has been plausibly argued that Gallus adopted from Euphorion the motif that there is no cure for love.⁴⁹ Similar processes of triangulation among Propertius, other Roman poets, and Hellenistic antecedents allow for reasonable inferences about the presence of Gallus elsewhere. The programmatic opening poem of Propertius' second book declares "his mistress Cynthia to be an elegant sufficiency for inspiration" (2.1.3–4).⁵⁰

non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo:
ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.

It is not Calliope, not Apollo that puts these songs in my mind: my girl herself creates the inspiration.

Now when Martial acknowledges Gallus among the four canonical elegists, the similar phrasing suggests that he and Propertius are both referring to a particular passage in Gallus' verse: *ingenium Galli pulchra Lycoris erat* (8.73.6, "lovely Lycoris was the inspiration of Gallus").⁵¹ Allusions to Gallus thus bracket the second book as we now have it.

⁴⁶ Cf. Tränkle (1960) 12–17, Ross (1975) 61–64. The theme is resumed in 2.19.17–26, where Propertius casts himself in the role of a would-be Milanion, going hunting to be with Cynthia.

⁴⁷ For coincidences with *Ecl.* 10, cf. Courtney (1993) 269.

⁴⁸ Cf. Knox (1986) 15–16.

⁴⁹ Tränkle (1960) 22–23.

⁵⁰ Commager (1962) 5.

⁵¹ Cf. Courtney (1993) 261. Ross (1975) 115–16 thus cannot be right in reading this couplet as an attempt by Propertius "to distinguish his elegy from Gallus"; in fact, he asserts his position squarely in the tradition of Gallus.

The third poem in the second book is also a statement of the artistic importance of Propertius' inspiration. Its concluding couplet highlights the universality of this theme (2.3.43–44):

siue illam Hesperiiis, siue illam ostendet Eois,
uret et Eoos, uret et Hesperios.⁵²

whether he exhibits her to the lands of the West or the East, he will set on fire both East and West.

Ovid's tribute to Gallus in the concluding poem of the first book of his reordered *Amores* clearly echoes the same source (1.15.29–30):⁵³

Gallus et Hesperiiis et Gallus notus Eois,
et sua cum Gallo nota Lycoris erit.

Gallus shall be known to the lands of the West, and Gallus to the lands of the East, and with Gallus his own Lycoris shall be known.

It is perhaps not coincidence that these three instances are clustered in the second book. Some weight must be given to what Propertius says about Gallus' influence and the prominence of his poetry to Lycoris. Confirmation of this is to be found in the most recent accretion to our small store of information about this last of the neoterics, the papyrus from Qasr Ibrîm (fr. 2.6–7 Courtney):

] tandem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae
quae possem domina deicere digna mea.

At last the . . . Muses have made poems that I could utter as worthy of my mistress.

The publication of the papyrus confirms the suspicion of many that the motif of love as a form of slavery and the beloved as a mistress (*domina*) originated with Gallus.⁵⁴

It is no accident that allusions to the neoterics' love poetry are concentrated in the first two (in reality, three) books of the elegies.

⁵² With most recent editors (e.g., Fedeli 1984 and Goold 1990). I assume that a new poem begins with line 45.

⁵³ See McKeown (1989) 411–12, and cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.537 *Vesper et Eoae nouere Lycorida terrae*.

⁵⁴ Cf. Anderson et al. (1979) 144, Courtney (1993) 267. For the motif in the elegists, cf. Lyne (1979), though his rejection of Gallus' use of the theme (121–23) is discredited by the papyrus, which was published in the same year. For other influences of Gallus that are perhaps traceable to the papyrus, see O'Hara (1989).

Cynthia is at once the subject of, and the metaphor for, Propertius' poetry throughout this period.⁵⁵ It is possible that we have another testimony of this unique concentration in the publication activity of Ovid, who reduced his original five books of elegies to three books of *Amores*. Ovid, who probably knew Propertius' work in five books of elegies, reshaped his own canon to reflect the central preoccupation of Propertius' first three books of love poetry. This was the common legacy of the neoteric poets, absorbed into the tradition by Gallus, who thereby is represented as the first of the elegists, though he has as much claim to be the last of the neoterics. With the third book, Propertius is "no lover in search of a means of expression, but a poet in search of subjects."⁵⁶ In Books 3 and 4 as we now have them, the direct engagement with Hellenistic sources in general and Callimachus in particular is, of course, also a neoteric gesture, but it belongs to a different phase of Propertius' career.

⁵⁵ Cf. Ross (1975) 125: "The fact that Cynthia is actually *named* far less in Book III than previously seems of particular importance when we consider that 'Cynthia' often stood for his 'love-elegy'."

⁵⁶ Camps (1966) 2. For the transitional nature of Book 3, generally acknowledged by most critics, cf., e.g., Hubbard (1975) 68–115, Ross (1975) 120–30.

PART FOUR

THE MAJOR THEMES OF PROPERTIUS' POETRY
AND HIS POETIC TECHNIQUE

CHAPTER SEVEN

MAJOR THEMES AND MOTIFS IN PROPERTIUS' LOVE POETRY

Robert Maltby

The following study of major themes and motifs in Propertius aims to set out as succinctly as possible what these motifs were and, in particular, to examine how Propertius' use of them may have differed from that of Tibullus and Ovid. An equally important aim was to provide some sense of the way in which these different motifs were distributed and developed over the four books of the corpus. While necessarily having to be selective, the intention was to cover as far as possible all the main themes. Many of these have had individual studies devoted to them, and so the prime importance of the present exercise is to give a comprehensive overview, providing, where appropriate, bibliographical references to earlier treatments and not covering in detail material that has been sufficiently analyzed elsewhere. Interestingly, all these major themes, with the exception of that relating to Propertius' own poetic composition, are foreshadowed in the programmatic first elegy of the monobiblos.

Teacher of Love

*me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator.*¹ (1.7.13)²

"Hereafter let the neglected lover read me avidly."

The theme of the "teacher of love" *praeceptor amoris* is well attested in all the elegists and forms the basis of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*. In Propertius this theme makes its appearance as early as the end of

¹ The text quoted is normally that of W. A. Camps (1961–1967).

² For the *praeceptor amoris* theme generally in elegy, see Wheeler (1910/11) and James (2003) 161–67. For the theme in Propertius, see Wheeler (1910).

his first poem, where he warns his friends to remain faithful to one mistress, if they are happy in love, and to avoid the troubles that have beset his own affair with Cynthia:

*in me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras,
et nullo uacuis tempore defit Amor.
hoc, moneo, uitate malum: sua quemque moretur
cura, neque assueto mutet amore locum.
quod si quis monitis tardas aduerterit auris,
heu referet quanto uerba dolore mea!* (1.1.33–38)

“On me our Venus levies bitter nights and Love that has no respite never fails. Shun this woe of mine, I warn you: let each cling to his own beloved, nor change when love has found its accustomed home. But if anyone should lend his ear too late to my warnings, alas with what agony will he recall my words!”

As the prominence of this theme in the programmatic first poem suggests, it is to play an important role in Book 1, but its importance gradually recedes as Propertius moves away from erotic themes to broaden the scope of his elegies; it is less frequent in Book 2, rare in Book 3 and totally absent from Book 4. One characteristic feature of the use of this theme in Propertius deserves more attention. This is the use of aphorisms involving the personified Amor (as in line 34 above) to back up the didactic points he makes. With the possible exception of 2.18.21–22, where Cupid is used to illustrate the point that no lover remains in favor for long: *saepe Cupido/huic malus esse solet, cui bonus ante fuit*, “often Cupid is unkind to the lover to whom he was kind before”, Amor is the only god who appears in this role. In 1.1, as one would expect in an opening poem, this device is used with special reference to Propertius’ own situation. It is Amor who has taught him to hate chaste girls and to live a life devoid of reason (1.1.5–6). The general point illustrated by the Milanion myth (1.1.9–16) on the usefulness of prayers and loyal service in the pursuit of the beloved does not hold true in Propertius’ own case, where Love refuses to follow his usual well-trodden paths:

*in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artis,
nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire uias.* (1.1.17–18)

“In my case slow Love thinks up no devices, and does not remember to tread, as before, his well-known paths.”

In the beginning of the second poem, addressed to Cynthia, Propertius takes up a didactic stance in an attempt to persuade his mistress that beauty unadorned is best. He decks out his arguments in good

rhetorical style with parallels from nature (9–14) and mythological *exempla* (15–22). Immediately before this the figure of Amor is used to drive home his point *nudus Amor formae non amat artificem* (8) “Love goes naked and does not love those who make an artifice of beauty”. Similarly, in his warning to Gallus in 1.5 to avoid becoming involved with Cynthia, Propertius again employs the figure of Amor to make the point that Gallus’ ancient ancestry will be of no avail should he fall prey to Cynthia’s charms: *nescit Amor priscis cedere imaginibus* (1.5.24) “Love scorns to yield to ancestral images”. In exactly the same terms in poem 1.14 Propertius makes it clear to Tullus that Love makes no concessions to wealth: *nescit Amor magnis cedere diuitiis* (8) “Love scorns to yield to great wealth”. In poem 1.7, addressed to the epic poet Ponticus, Propertius stresses the usefulness of his own elegiac poetry as a source of help for neglected lovers:

*me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator,
et prosint illi cognita nostra mala.* (1.7.13–14)

“Hereafter let the neglected lover read me avidly, and may his knowledge of my woes profit him.”

This picks up the point made earlier at 1.1.34–38 and is repeated in Apollo’s advice to Propertius near the beginning of Book 3:

*ut tuus in scamno iactetur saepe libellus,
quem legat exspectans sola puella uirum.* (3.3.19–20)

“So that your book may often be displayed on the bedside table to be read by a lonely girl awaiting her lover.”

The general reference in 1.7.13–14 to Propertius’ powers as a *praeceptor amoris* leads to some specific advice for Ponticus. Should he fall in love it would be more useful to write elegy than epic (15–19), but any hopes of this being possible are dashed in another one-line reference to Amor: *nec tibi subiciet carmina serus Amor* (20) “late Love will not provide you with songs”. The dangers posed by Amor coming late in life (perhaps already hinted at in Propertius’ case in 1.1.17 *tardus Amor* “slow Love”) are repeated more forcefully in the last line of the poem with a typical aphorism involving Amor: *saepe uenit magno faenore tardus Amor* (1.7.26) “Love that comes late often claims a heavy interest”. In 1.9, when Ponticus eventually succumbs to love, Propertius once again emphasizes both his own erotodidactic powers:

*non me Chaoniae uincant in amore columbae
dicere, quos iuuenes quaeque puella domet.
me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum.* (1.9.5–7)

“In the field of love Chaonian doves could not beat me in divining which youths each girl should subdue. Suffering and tears have made me deservedly expert.”

and the superiority of elegy over epic in matters of love, this second point being backed up again by a reference to personified Amor:

*plus in amore ualet Mimnermi uersus Homero:
carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor.* (1.9.11–12)

“In love Mimnermus’ verse is worth more than Homer’s: peaceful Love demands gentle poems.”

Poem 9 ends, just as poem 7 had, with a general statement regarding the nature of love *dicere quo pereas saepe in amore leuat* (34) “often in love it brings relief to tell the source of one’s suffering”. In both cases these general statements back up advice from the author to his “pupil”: *tu caue nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu* (1.7.25) “you beware not to scorn my songs in your pride” and *quare, si pudor est, quam primum errata fatere* (1.9.33) “therefore, if you have any shame, admit your error at once”. In poem 10, addressed to Gallus in the aftermath of Propertius’ witnessing his lovemaking, the poet again emphasizes his erotodidactic prowess:

*possum ego diuersos iterum coniungere amantes,
et dominae tardas possum aperire fores;
et possum alterius curas sanare recentis,
nec leuis in uerbis est medicina meis.* (1.10.15–18)

“I can join parted lovers and I can open a mistress’s reluctant door; I can cure another’s fresh grief; not slight is the healing power in my words.”

Again it is Love personified who, together with Cynthia, has taught him all he knows:

*Cynthia me docuit semper quaecumque petenda
quaeque cauenda forent: non nihil egit Amor.* (1.10.19–20)

“Cynthia has taught me what everyone should always seek, what things they should avoid: Love has done something for me.”

Of course there is irony, as Holzberg has pointed out,³ in the fact that this supposed expertise has been of no benefit to Propertius himself as the many problems in his affair with Cynthia, illustrated

³ Holzberg (2001) 44.

even in the first book, demonstrate. By the end of Book 1 all his teaching has amounted to is that he can serve as a warning to others *similes moniturus amantes* (1.15.41) "I shall be a warning to similar lovers" to avoid the faults he himself has fallen into.

In Book 2 the poet's stance as *praeceptor amoris* is less pervasive, but the aphorisms linked to Amor continue. The first of these at 2.3.8: *differtur, numquam tollitur ullus amor* "Love may be put off, never removed" explains why Propertius' attempt to move on from love elegy to more serious compositions *aut ego si possem studiis uigilare seueris* (2.3.7) "whether I could spend my nights in serious studies" failed. At 2.4.14 *sic est incautum, quidquid habetur amor* "whatever love is it cannot be guarded against" illustrates the point that no one can guard against love. A lover can be alive at one moment and dead the next: *ambulat—et subito mirantur funus amici!* (2.4.13) "he is out walking—and suddenly his friends are surprised at his funeral". At 2.6.21–2 *tu rapere intactas docuisti impune Sabinas:/per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor* "you taught us to rape with impunity the Sabine virgins. Because of you now Love dares anything in Rome". The poet, tongue in cheek, attributes current decadence in Rome to the example of Romulus who encouraged the rape of the Sabine virgins. In a mythological *exemplum* at 2.8.29–38 Propertius demonstrates how Achilles was kept from battle by his grief at the loss of Briseis and concludes in the final line of the poem with the question *mirum, si de me iure triumphat Amor?* (2.8.40) "is it surprising if Love justly triumphs over me?". If Love can triumph over a mythological figure of the stature of Achilles, what wonder if he triumphs over Propertius? In 2.22, an erotodidactic poem addressed to Demophoon on the advisability of having more than one mistress, Propertius counters an objection from Demophoon by the statement that Love never needs to ask the question "why?":

quaeris, Demophoon, cur sim tam mollis in omnis?
quod quaeris, "quare", non habet ullus amor. (2.22.13–14)

"You ask, Demophoon, why I am susceptible to all women? Love does not know the meaning of your question 'Why?'"

A little later in the same poem Propertius illustrates the point that love is no hardship to him by the statement that love does not become exhausted through frequent use: *nullus amor uires eripit ipse suas* (2.22.28) "No love exhausts its own strength". Finally at 2.33.41–42 another aphorism involving Amor explains why no woman is content to sleep alone:

*nulla tamen lecto recipit se sola libenter:
est quiddam, quod uos quaerere cogat Amor.*

“No woman takes herself willingly to bed. There is something that Love compels you all to seek.”

The *praeceptor amoris* stance in general is less obvious in the second book than in the first. The best example is perhaps in poem 2.4 where the initial six lines on the difficulty of loving girls, addressed to an unspecified hearer, are balanced at the end of the poem by six lines (17–22) on the ease of pederastic love, again spoken to an unspecified addressee. The central section of the poem, containing the aphorism about Amor quoted above (2.4.14), discusses the difficulties of Propertius’ affair, which is characterized as a disease. In the central section of 2.25, lines 21–34, Propertius addresses a warning to successful lovers, advising them not to be overconfident. The central couplet of this passage:

*mendaces ludunt flatus in amore secundi:
si qua uenit sero, magna ruina uenit* (2.25.27–28)

“Fair winds in love are deceitful and mock us: mighty is the fall that comes late.”

echoes the warning to Ponticus (1.7.20ff.) about Love coming late, discussed above. The opening of the passage, with its warning that no woman remains faithful for long, *credula, nulla diu femina pondus habet* (2.25.22) “credulous lover, no woman is faithful for long” looks forward to the second main occurrence of the *praeceptor* theme in Book 2 at 2.34.3ff. where the dangers of infidelity in love are compared to the dangers of civil strife, as suggested particularly in the phrase *tristia arma* (6) “bitter arms”:

*expertus dico, nemo est in amore fidelis:
formosam raro non sibi quisque petit.
polluit ille deus cognatos, soluit amicos,
et bene concordēs tristia ad arma uocat.* (2.34.3–6)

“I speak as an expert, no one is faithful in love: rarely does any man not seek a beautiful woman for himself. That god pollutes kinsmen, separates friends and calls to bitter arms those that are in close harmony.”

A passing reference in 2.21.3 *sed tibi iam uideor Dodona uerior augur?* “but do I not seem to you now to be a truer augur than Dodona?” to Propertius’ prophetic skills in his warning to Panthus about his lover recall the connection of prophecy with the *praeceptor* theme in the poem to Ponticus 1.9.5–6 discussed above.

This leads us to Book 3 and the next appearance of the theme at 3.8.17f. Propertius claims that his sufferings in love have led him to become a true *haruspex* in matters of the heart, the lesson in question being that no love can be true that is not subject to quarrels:

*non est certa fides, quam non in iurgia uertas:
hostibus eueniat lenta puella meis.* (3.8.19–20)

“No love is sure that cannot be provoked to quarrels: let an unfeeling girl be the fate of my enemies.”

Unless one counts a passing use of an aphorism involving Amor in relation to the effect of the sight of his mistress (discussed below) at 3.21.4 *ipse alimenta sibi maxima praebet amor* “Love itself provides its own greatest nourishment” this is the last occurrence of the *praeceptor* theme in Propertius, which clearly diminishes in importance after Book 2.

Love as a Disease

solus amor morbi non amat artificem. (2.1.58)⁴

“Only love loves not the doctor of its disease.”

The importance of the theme of love as a wound, or as a mental or physical disease, is commonplace in elegy and has a long history in earlier literature. Just as love can be represented as a disease, *malum/mala*, as at 1.1.35, 1.5.4, 1.7.14, 2.4.10, 3.17.10, so its cure can be discussed in terms of the Theocritean⁵ image of a *medicina*, as at 1.5.28, 1.10.18, 2.1.57, 3.17.4. This theme is again announced clearly in Propertius' programmatic first elegy. The poet's love for Cynthia is a madness that has lasted for a year *et mihi iam toto furor hic non deficit anno* (1.1.7) “and this madness has not left me now for a whole year”. He begs his friends for a remedy for his diseased heart *quaerite non sani pectoris auxilia* (1.1.26) “seek a remedy for a heart that is sick”. To achieve this cure he is willing even to undergo the most savage form of cure known to ancient medicine, namely cautery *fortiter et ferrum saeuos patiemur et ignes* (1.1.27)⁶ “bravely will I bear the knife and the fierce cautery.”

⁴ For the general theme of love as a disease in ancient literature, see Funke (1990); on Propertius' use of it, see Burck (1952) 167, Boucher (1965) 26.

⁵ Theocr. *Id.* 11. 1–6.

⁶ For *ferrum et ignes* as proverbial with reference to surgery, see Otto (1890) 170. For surgery in Hellenistic literature, see Giangrande (1974) 11.

There are some indications that Propertius had more than a passing interest in medical theory and practice. The most detailed treatment of this theme occurs in poem 2.4:

*non hic herba ualet, non hic nocturna Cytæis,
non Perimedæa gramina cocta manu;
quippe ubi nec causas nec apertos cernimus ictus;
unde tamen ueniant tot mala caeca uia est.
non eget hic medicis, non lectis mollibus aeger,
huic nullum caeli tempus et aura nocet;
ambulat – et subito mirantur funus amici! (2.4.7–13)*

“In such a case no herb avails, no Colchian sorceress of the night, no drug distilled by the hand of Perimede. For where we see neither causes nor clear blows, dark is the path whence so many ills arise. Such a sick man needs no doctors, no soft beds, it is not the climate or the air that harms him. He is out walking—and suddenly his friends are surprised at his funeral!”

The references in 9–10 to *causas*, *apertos ictus*, and *caeca uia* (“causes”, “clear blows” and a “dark path”) appear to recall the “hidden” and “overt” causes of diseases discussed in the medical theorists of the time.⁷ Of the overt causes, *caeli tempus* and *aura* (“the climate” and “the air”) are discussed in ancient writers from the Hippocratic “Airs and Waters” on, and commonly held responsible for the outbreak of disease. At 1.1.26 the word *auxilia* (“remedy”) used for *remedium* is a medical technical term.⁸ At 3.24.18 Propertius uses the technical *coeo* of wounds “healing”: *uulneraque ad sanum nunc coiere mea*⁹ “now my wounds knit and heal”. In Book 4 the graphic description of the symptoms of tuberculosis (*tabes* in the Latin medical writers) in the *lena* Acanthis suggests again an interest in disease that goes beyond its use as an elegiac topos:

*uidi ego rugoso tussim concrecere collo,
sputaque per dentes ire cruenta cauos. (4.5.67–68)*

“I have seen the phlegm clotting in her wrinkled throat, and the bloody spit trickle through her hollow teeth.”

⁷ See Celsus *Proem.* 13 *qui rationalem medicinam profitentur, haec necessaria esse proponunt: abditarum et morbos continentium causarum notitiam, deinde euentium; post haec etiam naturalium actionum.*

⁸ See Fedeli (1980) on 1.1.26 for references.

⁹ Cf. Celsus 2.10.15, 8.8.1a and see *OLD coeo* 5.

This is not to say that the usual elegiac themes of the lover's pallor, thinness, madness, and wounds are not exploited fully, particularly in Book 1. It was a commonplace idea in ancient erotic poetry that a lover's pallor indicated the depth of his passion. This is why at 1.1.22 Propertius begs the witches he calls to his aid to make Cynthia paler than he is. In addition to the mention of Propertius' own pallor at 1.5.21 there are references to the pallor of Ponticus 1.9.17 and Gallus 1.13.7 when they fall in love, and to the changes in color of Cynthia caused by Propertius at 1.6.6 and by his rival at 1.15.39. Significantly the theme is rare outside the emotionally intense Book 1, occurring in other books only at 3.8.28 where Propertius expresses his wish to be pale with longing for an angry mistress, and at 4.3.28 where Arethusa hopes that any pallor in her husband Lycotas' complexion is caused by his desire for her.

The thinness of the lover is mentioned in combination with pallor with reference to Propertius himself at 1.5.22 and to Lycotas at 4.3.27. At 2.22.21 Propertius claims, by an ironic reversal of the usual topos, that constant lovemaking does not make him thin, and at 3.16.11ff. the anaemic state of the average lover, it is argued, should prevent his being attacked by bloodthirsty brigands.

The theme of love as an irrational *furor*, introduced at 1.1.7, is restricted entirely to Book 1. At 1.4.11 Cynthia's beauty is represented as only a minor part of what inflames Propertius with furious passion: *haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoris* "but this beauty is but the least part of my frenzy". At 1.5.3 Gallus is accused of being a madman for wishing to experience the pain of Propertius' passion *quid tibi uis, insane? meos sentire furores?* "What do you wish for, madman? To feel my frenzy?" When Gallus does fall in love with another girl the affair is characterized by *furor*:

*non ego complexus potui diducere uestros:
tantus erat demens inter utrosque furor.* (1.13.19–20)

"I could not part your embraces; so great was the wild frenzy between you both."

In Books 2 and 3 *furor* is replaced by the terms *insanus/insanio/uesanus*. At 2.14.18 Propertius complains that in the madness of love no man can see clearly how to act *scilicet insano nemo in amore uidet* "indeed in mad love no one sees his way". In the following poem he argues that no limits should be set to the frenzy of love: 2.15.29 *errat, qui finem uesani quaerit amoris* "he is wrong who wishes to set a limit on

mad love". At 2.34.25 he rejoices that Lynceus, though late, has fallen madly in love *Lynceus ipse meus seros insanit amores!* "my own Lynceus is himself mad with late love!" Apart from a single reference to Venus as *insana* at 3.17.3 and from the use of the *Mens Bona* theme at 3.24.19 (see below) the theme of love as madness is absent from Book 3. The theme of love as a wound makes its first appearance with reference to the wound caused by Cupid's arrows at 2.12.12 *nec quisquam ex illo uulnere sanus abit* "and no one escapes unharmed from that wound". At 2.22.7 *interea nostri quaerunt sibi uulnus ocelli* "meanwhile our eyes seek out their own wound" and 2.25.46 *haec atque illa mali uulneris una uia est* "both this woman and that are alike a single road to a cruel wound" the reference is to wounds caused by the attractions of a variety of girls. At 2.34.92 the poet Gallus is represented as washing away the wounds of his love for Lycoris in the waters of the underworld, just as at 3.21.32 Propertius proposes to heal the wounds of his own love through time and distant separation from his mistress. Finally, at the end of his affair with Cynthia in 3.24.18, Propertius represents his wounds as healing (3.24.18 quoted above) and, as an indication of his cure from mental anguish, he dedicates himself to *Mens Bona* (3.24.19).

*Love as Slavery*¹⁰

VNIUS HIC QVONDAM SERVVS AMORIS ERAT (2.13.36)

"HE WAS ONCE THE SLAVE OF A SINGLE LOVE"

The above inscription imagined by Propertius for his own tomb sums up in a single line one of the important themes of his love poetry, the theme of *seruitium amoris*. Of all the Roman elegists it is Propertius who is most inclined to see his love as a form of slavery.¹¹ This is a subject that has been treated in detail elsewhere and needs only a brief summary in the present section. The idea of a man's love for a woman being seen in terms of a voluntary servitude is peculiar to Latin poetry and has no real equivalent in Greek literature. The essence of the idea is encapsulated in the notion of the mistress as

¹⁰ For *seruitium amoris*, see Copley (1947), Lyne (1979), Murgatroyd (1981), Veyne (1988) 132–50, Laigneau (1999) 328–35, James (2003) 145–50.

¹¹ Boucher (1965) 91 n. 1.

era or *domina* (both imply "mistress" in the literal sense). It is based on the type of reversal of normal social relations that has its roots perhaps in the Saturnalian background to native Italian comedy. In Propertius this state, incompatible as it is with the *libertas* "freedom" of a free Roman citizen, is a necessary prerequisite for success in love. It is a state that demands blind obedience in word and deed, as the warning to Ponticus at the opening of 1.9 shows:

*Dicebam tibi uenturos, irrisor, amores,
nec tibi perpetuo libera uerba fore:
ecce iaces supplexque uenis ad iura puellae,
et tibi nunc quaeuis imperat empta modo.* (1.9.1–4)

"Mocker, I said that love would come to you, and that you would not keep your freedom of speech forever. See you are laid low and go as a suppliant at a girl's will and now some or other girl bought just lately, gives you orders."

The more humility the lover shows the more likely he is to retain his girl, as Gallus is told:

*at quo sis humilis magis et subiectus amori,
hoc magis effectus saepe fruar bono.
is poterit felix una remanere puella,
qui numquam uacuo pectore liber erit.* (1.10.27–30)

"But the more humble you are, the more subservient to love, the more often will you enjoy success. He will be able to remain happily in the love of one woman, whose heart is never empty and fancy free."

No lover retains his freedom of action:

*libertas quoniam nulli iam restat amanti,
nullus liber erit, si quis amare uolet.* (2.23.23–24)

"Since there remains no freedom for a lover, no man will be free, if he wishes to love."

Hence Propertius is no longer *liber* in his mistress's eyes: *ecquandone tibi liber sum uisus?* (2.8.15) "did I ever seem to be a free man to you?" Rather, he sees his relationship with her as slavery (1.4.4 *assueto seruitio* "accustomed servitude"; 1.5.19 *graue seruitium* "harsh servitude"). Even when things are going well it is a gentle form of slavery *seruitium mite* (2.20.20) "gentle servitude", or its chains are sweet *dulcia uincla* (3.15.10) "sweet chains". Changing to a new mistress merely involves transferring one's slavery elsewhere: *sunt quoque translato gaudia seruitio* (1.12.18) "there is joy also in changing one's servitude". At the end of the

affair his only claim is to have served his mistress faithfully for five years: *quinque tibi potui seruire fideliter annos* (3.25.3) "I was able to serve you faithfully for five years". Only once is this relationship reversed and in a passage unique in Roman elegy Propertius expresses his pride in having such a beautiful girl as his slave:

*nunc admirentur quod tam mihi pulchra puella
seruiat et tota dicar in urbe potens!* (2.26.21–22).

"Now let men marvel that such a beautiful girl is my slave and let all the city speak of my power!"

*Love as Military Service*¹²

*non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis;
hanc me militiam fata subire uolunt.* (1.6.29–30)

"I was not born fit for praise or for arms; this warfare of love is what the fates wish me to undergo."

The theme of *militia amoris* has a long history in both Greek and Roman literature and has been treated in detail by a number of modern writers. Propertius uses the theme less frequently than Tibullus¹³ and Ovid,¹⁴ who makes it the subject of a whole poem, *Amores* 1.9. The earliest recorded occurrence is in Greek lyric (Sappho fr. 1.28 *PLF*). It then occurs in elegy (Theogn. 1286f.) and tragedy (e.g., Soph. *Ant.* 781), but it does not become frequent until Alexandrian epigram. In Latin literature it is found in comedy (e.g., Plautus *Pers.* 231–33) and Catullus (e.g., 66.13–14) and reaches its peak of development in Roman elegy. Its particular relevance to this genre arises out of the common contrast between the life of military action and that of the elegiac lover. The elegist rejects "real" warfare and devotes himself to the battles of love. This is the context of 1.6.29–30 (quoted above) in which Propertius rejects an invitation from Tullus to join him on service abroad. This passage is close in tone to Tibullus 1.1.73–75 *nunc leuis est tractanda Venus . . . hic ego dux milesque bonus*,

¹² For *militia amoris* in Propertius, see Baker (1968) and in Ovid's *Amores* Thomas (1964); for the theme in elegy in general, see Spies (1930) and Murgatroyd (1975).

¹³ Tib. 1.1.75–6, 3.63–4, 10.53–8, 2.1.71–80, 3.33–8, 5.106, 6.1–10: see Maltby (2002) 149.

¹⁴ On Ovid's uses, see McKeown (1989) 257–60.

"now light love is our business . . . in this I am a leader and good soldier", which it may well have influenced. This theme of love as war occurs in Propertius in a variety of contexts. At 2.7.14–16:

*nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit.
quod si uera meae comitarem castra puellae,
non mihi sat magnus Castoris iret equus.*

"No soldier shall spring from my blood. But if I were to follow the true camp of my mistress, then Castor's war horse would not be big enough for me."

The context is that Propertius rejoices at the failure of Augustus' marriage legislation, which would have forced him to marry and produce legitimate children to serve in the army. In preference to this he would rather serve in his mistress's "camp". The camp image recurs twice in Book 4; once in relation to Propertius' vocation as a love elegist:

*at tu finge elegos, fallax opus: haec tua castra!—
scribat ut exemplo cetera turba tuo.
militiam Veneris blandis patiere sub armis,
et Veneris pueris utilis hostis eris. (4.1.135–38)*

"But you must compose elegy, a guileful task. This is your camp!—so that the rest of the throng write by your example. You will suffer service under the tender arms of Venus and will prove a fit adversary for Venus' boys."

and once in a joking reference at 4.8.28 to changing camp from Cynthia to another mistress *mutato uolui castra mouere toro* "having changed my bed I wished to change my camp". The *hostis* "enemy" metaphor seen in 4.1.138 above can be applied either to a hostile mistress *et tibi non tacitis uocibus hostis erit* "and she will be an enemy of yours with no silent voice", in a warning to Bassus of the dangers of crossing Cynthia at 1.4.18, or to a rival for one's mistress's affection as at 1.11.7. Lovemaking can be seen in terms of battles. At 2.1.45 Propertius expresses a preference for writing love elegy in the following terms: *nos contra angusto uersamus proelia lecto* "we by contrast wage battle on a narrow couch". A more detailed development of the theme occurs in Book 3:

*dum uincunt Danaï, dum restat barbarus Hector,
ille Helenae in gremio maxima bella gerit.
aut tecum aut pro te mihi cum riualibus arma
semper erunt: in te pax mihi nulla placet. (3.8.31–34)*

“While the Danaans were victorious and while savage Hector resisted them, he waged his greatest war in Helen’s embrace. Either against you or for you with my rivals I will always take up arms; with you I find no pleasure in peace.”

where Paris’ battles with Helen lead on to those between Propertius and his mistress.¹⁵

Although Propertius does not use this theme excessively in comparison with the other elegists, his development of the *hostis* and *castra* motifs is bold and effective.

*Love and Death*¹⁶

*multi longinquo periere in amore libenter,
in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat.* (1.6.27–28)

“Many have willingly perished in a long love-affair; in their number may the earth cover me too.”

Death would be ever present to the consciousness of a generation that had lived through the civil wars, and poems 1.21 and 1.22 reflect the way in which Propertius’ family was affected by these events. The elegiac genre had traditionally been associated with themes of lamentation,¹⁷ and its metre was that most commonly used in funeral inscriptions. The theme of death was exploited by all the elegists, but it assumed an overriding importance in the work of Propertius. This is a topic that has received extensive treatment elsewhere and will consequently receive only a brief summary here.

The ideal of love depicted by the Roman elegists¹⁸ was of a bond that would endure until, or, as sometimes in Propertius, beyond death. Love until death is the point illustrated in the quotation from 1.6.27–28 above. Similarly at 1.14.14 Propertius refers to the joys of his love for Cynthia lasting *dum me fata perire uolent* “until the fates shall wish me dead”. Such a love is seen as deserving of praise 2.1.47

¹⁵ For the *pax* metaphor in this context cf. 2.2.2 *at me composita pace fefellit Amor* and for *arma* in an erotic context cf. 1.3.16.

¹⁶ For death in Propertius, see Boucher (1965) 65–81, Baker (1970), Stok (1986), Papanghelis (1987), Marchese (1995), Müller (1995), Ottón Sobrino (1995), Foulon (1996).

¹⁷ For etymologies connecting *elegia* with lamentation, see Maltby (1991) s.vv. *elegeus*, *elegia*, *elegiacus*.

¹⁸ Tib. 1.1.59–68, Ov. *Am.* 1.3.17–18, Lygd. [Tib.] 3.2.11–12, 3.3.7–8.

laus in amore mori "it is worthy of praise to die in love". The motif is often joined with the theme of the mistress officiating at the poet's funeral. In 1.17, for example, where Propertius imagines flight from his mistress's anger resulting in his shipwreck on a deserted shore he compares the lack of burial he would receive there (8, 12–13) with the funeral he would have received in Rome in the presence of Cynthia:

*illic si qua meum sepelissent fata dolorem,
ultimus et posito staret amore lapis,
illa meo caros donasset funere crinis,
molliter et tenera poneret ossa rosa;
illa meum extremo clamasset pulvere nomen,
ut mihi non ullo pondere terra foret.* (1.17.19–24)

"If at home some fate had buried my sorrow, and a final gravestone stood above my ended love, she would have offered her precious hair at my funeral, and would have gently placed my bones on a bed of soft roses; she would have cried out my name over my last ashes, praying that the earth would lie lightly over me."

This passage is very reminiscent of Tibullus 1.1.61–62 *flebis et arsurum positum me, Delia, lecto/tristibus et lacrimis oscula mixta dabis* "You will weep and as I am placed on the pyre soon to be lit, Delia, you will give kisses mixed with sad tears", as well as of Tibullus' description of the funeral abroad in the absence of family and mistress at 1.3.5–9.¹⁹ As an extension of this idea of faithfulness until death, Propertius imagines at 2.1.55–56 his funeral procession being led out from his mistress's house; an idea picked up by the imagined pronouncement of Maecenas over Propertius' tomb at the end of the poem: "*Huic misero fatum dura puella fuit*" (2.1.78) "a harsh girl was the fate of this sad man". Again at 2.13.17ff. Cynthia is given detailed instructions about arranging the poet's simple funeral ceremony, including the epitaph to be placed on his grave:

*QUI NVNC IACET HORRIDA PVLVIS,
VNIVS HIC QVONDAM SERVVS AMORIS ERAT.* (2.13.35–6)

"HE WHO LIES NOW AS UNLOVELY DUST WAS ONCE THE SLAVE OF ONE LOVE."

The first epitaph in Roman elegy occurs at Tib. 1.3.55–56 and others are found at Prop. 4.7.85–86 and Ov. *Am.* 2.6.61–62. It had its roots in Hellenistic poetry²⁰ and had occurred earlier in Latin in the *Eclogues*

¹⁹ On the relative chronology of these poems, see Lyne (1998b).

²⁰ Theocr. *Id.* 1.120–21, [Theocr.] 23.47–48.

of Virgil (5.42–44), but the metre of elegy made it an especially appropriate form for this genre. Similarly at 2.24.33–38 Propertius asserts that he will remain faithful to Cynthia however long he lives, and imagines Cynthia officiating at his funeral and speaking words of praise over his bones. At the end of the poem his thoughts turn briefly to Cynthia's funeral, but the final couplet expresses the wish that she should die after him (51–52). At the end of the affair, when Propertius contemplates a visit to Athens to cure himself of his love for Cynthia, this theme is reversed and the poet expresses a preference for an honourable death, brought about by fate, rather than disgraceful love:

*seu moriar, fato, non turpi fractus amore;
atque erit illa mihi mortis honesta dies.* (3.21.33–34)

“Or if I die, let it be by fate and not broken by disgraceful love; that day of death will bring me no disgrace.”

Elsewhere the funeral motif is used to underline the fame the poet will earn after his death as a teacher of love:

*nec poterunt iuuenes nostro reticere sepulcro
“Ardoris nostri, magne poeta, iaces.”* (1.7.23–24)²¹

“And the youth will not be silent at my funeral: ‘Great poet of our passion, there you lie.’”

The lover can die of his passion at any time *ambulat—et subito mirantur funus amici!* (2.4.13 translated above) and the act of love itself can be described as a form of dying *cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella/uidimus* (1.10.5–6) “when I saw you, Gallus, dying in your mistress's arms”. At 2.26.57–58 this is seen as an honourable way to die: *quod mihi si ponenda tuo sit corpore uita/exitus hic nobis non inhonestus erit*²² “but if I were to lay down my life on your body, that would be no ignoble death for me”. Paradoxically success in love can be imagined as leading to immortality: *immortalis ero, si altera (sc. nox) talis erit* (2.14.10) “I will be immortal if I enjoy another such night” and *si dabit et multas (sc. noctes), fiam immortalis in illis* (2.15.39) “if she gives many such nights I will become immortal through them”.

The theme of love beyond death is explored in 1.19. Propertius here claims he does not fear death itself so much as the idea that

²¹ Cf. Tib. 1.1.65–66, 1.4.75–76.

²² For this theme, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.10.35–36.

after his death, though he will continue to love her, Cynthia will cease to love him. The continuity of love beyond the grave is illustrated by the myth of Protesilaus, who was allowed to visit his widow Laodamia as a ghost (7–10).²³ Propertius imagines his own faithfulness to Cynthia continuing beyond the grave (11–12):

*illic quidquid ero, semper tua dicar imago:
traicit et fati litora magnus amor.*

"Whatever I will be in death, I shall always be called your shade; great love crosses the shores of fate."

Lyne²⁴ is instructive on the way that Propertius' wish that Cynthia should continue to love him after his death: *quae tu uiua mea possis sentire fauilla!* (19) "like love to mine may you feel while still alive, when I am ashes" is undercut at the end of the poem and replaced by the more realistic wish that they should make the most of their love while they are still alive (25–26). The theme of love transcending death reappears in 2.27 where it is claimed that a mistress's voice can call her lover back from the dead:

*si modo clamantis reuocauerit aura puellae,
concessum nulla lege redibit iter.* (2.27.15–16)

"If only the whisper of his mistress's voice should call him back, he will return along the road allowed by no ordinance."

and the most detailed exploration of this theme comes in 4.7 where Cynthia's ghost comes back from the dead to upbraid Propertius.²⁵

Sometimes the theme of the funeral and death of one lover is replaced by the motif of the simultaneous death of both lovers. This theme is introduced for the first time in 1.15.21 with the myth of Evadne killing herself on the pyre of her husband Capaneus, and is developed at length in 3.13.15–22 where this Eastern practice of suttee is used to illustrate the idea that Eastern wives are more faithful than their Roman counterparts. This comes perhaps as a half-humorous reversal of the common Augustan polemic against Eastern decadence, directed particularly at Antony and Cleopatra. At 2.8 the theme of the joint death of both lovers forms the basis of a complicated and

²³ On this, see Lyne (1998d).

²⁴ Lyne (1980) 100–102.

²⁵ Cf. the speech of the dead Cornelia in 4.11, and see Otón Sobrino (1995).

much discussed²⁶ elegy. The poem begins with the faithlessness of the mistress, which leads to the idea of the poet's suicide.²⁷ This, in turn, via the myth of Haemon dying on Antigone's tomb, leads, somewhat illogically, to the idea that the poet's mistress should not escape his fate but should die with him. In this poem, then, the theme of joint death implying faithfulness beyond the grave is replaced by the melodramatic threat of vengeful murder accompanied by suicide. At 2.28 there is a return to the more traditional use of this theme. On the occasion of his mistress's illness Propertius prays to Jupiter that both partners should either die together or live together:

si non unius, quaeso, miserere duorum!
uiuam, si uiuet; si cadet illa, cadam. (2.28.41–42)

"If you pity not one, I pray, pity both of us! May I live if she lives and die if she dies."

The theme of death is clearly one that fascinated Propertius and served to lend drama and pathos to a wide variety of elegiac situations.

*Vision*²⁸

si nescis, oculi sunt in amore duces. (2.15.12)

"If you know not, the eyes are the leaders in love."

Of all the elegists, Propertius stands out for the strength of his visual imagination. The myths in which his poems abound appear often to be inspired by contemporary pictures, wall paintings, or sculptures. His love of the plastic arts is well documented in his poetry; witness his splendid description of the statues in the temple of Apollo Palatinus (2.31.1–16). As an illustration of the point that different artists win fame in different fields, he gives an enthusiastic account of the classic artists, sculptors, and metal workers of Greece (3.9.9–16). A projected visit to Athens is motivated in part by a desire to view the famous

²⁶ Lyne (1980) 91–92, Papanghelis (1987) 133–35, Sharrock (2000), 276–80, James (2003) 192–93.

²⁷ The suicide motif, common in the monologues of young men in Roman comedy, occurs elsewhere in Prop. at 2.7.7–8, 2.34.13–14. See Navarro Antolín (1997).

²⁸ On the visual aspect of Propertius' writing, see Boucher (1965) 41–62, Hubbard (1974) 164–66.

pictures and sculptures on display there (3.21.29–30). All this is well known, but the role of the visual as a theme in Propertius' treatment of love has perhaps not received the attention it deserves.

When in the first line of his first poem Propertius states that it was through her eyes that Cynthia captured him, he is announcing a theme which, in its various forms, is to play a major role in his love poetry, particularly in the first two books. An essential element in Propertius' erotodidaxis is that the eyes are the road to love. Two key texts make this point clear. The first occurs in an ecstatic poem on a successful night of love, 2.15, in which Propertius underlines the importance of the visual aspect in lovemaking:

*non iuuat in caeco Venerem corrumpere motu:
si nescis, oculi sunt in amore duces.* (2.15.11–12)

"There is no joy in spoiling love by sightless motion. If you know not, the eyes are the leaders in love."

The point is illustrated by two mythological exempla (Paris falling in love at the sight of the naked Helen, and Luna at the sight of the naked Endymion). If Cynthia persists in lying clothed, she will have her clothes ripped from her by her lover's hand. The lesson is concluded with a Catullan reminiscence, which, however, brings out more clearly than its original the visual theme:

*dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore:
nox tibi longa uenit, nec reditura dies.* (2.15.23–24)

"While the fates allow let us sate our eyes on love. The long night comes to you and day will not return."

(Cf. Cat 5.5–6; Tib. 1.1.69, Ov. Am. 2.9.42)

Significantly the successful night of love described here and in 2.14 comes as a result of Propertius being cured of a mental blindness that had prevented him previously from understanding the secret of such a success:

*ante pedes caecis lucebat semita nobis:
scilicet insano nemo in amore uidet.
hoc sensi prodesse magis: contemnite, amantes!
sic hodie ueniet, si qua negauit heri.* (2.14.17–20)

"The path shone clear before my feet, but I was blind. Indeed in frenzied love no man can see. This is what I have found to be the best cure: be disdainful, lovers. Thus she will come today, who came not yesterday."

The second important text comes at the end of 2.25 and consists of a warning of the dangers involved in serving more than one love:

*at, uos qui officia in multos reuocatis amores,
quantum sic cruciat lumina uestra dolor!
uidistis pleno teneram candore puellam,
uidistis fusco, ducit uterque color;
uidistis quandam Argiuam prodente figura,
uidistis nostras, utraque forma rapit;
illaque plebeio uel sit sandycis amictu:
haec atque illa mali uulneris una uia est.
cum satis una tuis insomnia portet ocellis,
una sit et cuius femina multa mala.* (2.25.39–48)

“But you who direct a man’s attentions to many loves, what agony torments your eyes. You see a young girl of fair complexion, or one of dark complexion; both colors attract you. You see a girl whose shape betrays an Argive, or you see Roman girls; both beauties allure. Though she is clad in plebeian robe or in scarlet, both this woman and that are alike a single road to a cruel wound. Since one girl is sufficient to keep your eyes from sleep, one girl spells trouble enough for any man.”

Here the quadruple *uidistis* introduces the idea that to see is to fall in love. But the emphasis here is on the agony that such multiple encounters bring. Love is an agony that torments the eyes (40) and the eyes are the way through which the painful wound of love enters its victim (46). This theme of the *uulnus* of love had occurred earlier in Book 2 in a poem in which Propertius had advised exactly the opposite approach to that suggested in 2.25. In 2.22 Propertius had addressed Demophoon on the advisability of having more than one mistress and had described there how in his pursuit of multiple partners his eyes had sought their own wound: *interea nostri quaerunt sibi uulnus ocelli* (2.22.7) “meanwhile our eyes seek wounds for themselves”. In Book 1 the visual effect of love is imagined to be great enough to extend beyond the grave:

*non adeo leuiter nostris puer haesit ocellis,
ut meus oblito pulvis amore uacet.* (1.19.5–6)

“Cupid has not so lightly stuck in my eyes that my dust could forget my love for you.”

In Book 3, however, although the sight of the mistress is still seen as one of the main roots of his passion;

*crescit enim assidue spectando cura puellae:
ipse alimenta sibi maxima praebet amor.* (3.21.3–4)

"Love for my girl grows incessantly with seeing her; love itself provides its own greatest nourishment."

the distance involved in a proposed trip to Athens is seen as being enough to banish Cynthia from his eyes and consequently his love from his heart:

*unum erit auxilium: mutatis Cynthia terris
quantum oculis, animo tam procul ibit amor.* (3.21.9–10)

"There will be one remedy; if I move to another land, love will be as far from my mind as Cynthia from my eyes."

The corollary of the fact that vision leads to love is that in order to preserve her lover's fidelity, a mistress should not allow his eyes to wander. So in his warning to Gallus to keep away from Cynthia, Propertius points out that she would not allow him freedom to sleep or to let his eyes range at will *non tibi iam somnos, non illa relinquet ocellos* (1.5.11) "she will not now leave you your sleep or your eyes". Ponticus is given a similar warning of the dangers of falling in love and not being allowed to give his eyes free rein:

*quippe ubi non liceat uacuos seducere ocellos,
nec uigilare alio nomine cedat Amor.* (1.9.27–28)

"Especially as Love will not allow you to turn your eyes freely where you like or to stay awake for anyone else but her."

Conversely any man who sees Cynthia will commit the sin of falling in love with her:

*qui uidet is peccat: qui te non uiderit ergo,
non cupiet: facti lumina crimen habent.* (2.32.1–2)

"He who sees you sins; he who does not see you will not desire you: the eyes bear the blame for the deed."

Closely related to this theme is that of the beauty of the mistress's eyes and their power over her lovers. As far as Propertius was concerned it was the beauty of Cynthia's eyes that first captured him (1.1.1). They could persuade him to believe her falsehoods (1.15.33–34) and cause him to die of love (1.15.41). Her eyes closing in sleep inspire his songs (2.1.11) and their power over him is second only to that of her abilities as a singer and poetess (2.3.14–22). When Propertius dreams of his mistress drowning at sea, his main fear is that the sight of her eyes will cause the sea god Glaucus to make her his mistress (2.26.13–14).

The theme of vision also enters into Propertius' voyeurism in regard to the affair of his friend Gallus. Propertius was there to watch their embraces:

*cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella
uidimus et longa ducere uerba mora!* (1.10.5–6)

"When we saw you dying, Gallus, in your girl's embrace and speaking words with long-drawn silences!"

and also:

*uidi ego te toto uinctum languescere collo
et flere iniectis, Galle, diu manibus,
et cupere optatis animam deponere uerbis,
et quae deinde meus celat, amice, pudor.* (1.13.15–18)

"I saw you languish, Gallus, with your neck in close embrace, and weep for a long while with your arms about her, and long to lay down your life for her sweet words; finally, my friend, I saw things that my modesty conceals."

As Nicholson first pointed out,²⁹ there is perhaps an intentional echo of these poems in 1.21, in which a relative of Propertius (possibly an uncle) turns his eyes from another Gallus (perhaps the father of the addressee in 1.10 and 1.13) who is dying in battle:

quid nostro gemitu turgentia lumina torques? (1.21.3)

"Why at my groan do you turn away those swollen eyes?"

In the next generation Propertius turns his eyes toward the younger Gallus dying metaphorically of love.

Enough has been said in this section to highlight the importance in Propertius of a theme that, as far as I am aware, has no echoes in Tibullus and plays only a minor role in Ovid's *Amores* (1.10.10, 2.17.12, 3.11.48).

*Poetry*³⁰

Unlike his contemporary Tibullus who rarely mentions poetry or poets, Propertius frequently discusses his literary aspirations and the

²⁹ Nicholson (1988/1989) 143ff.

³⁰ On the poetics of Propertius, see Boucher (1965) 161–225, Fedeli (1981), Mitchell (1985), Álvarez Hernández (1997).

nature of his poetic inspiration. This is a theme that runs through all four of his books, though a marked development is to be discerned from one book to the next as his self-confidence as a poet increases or as he responds to pressure from patrons.

In the first book the theme is developed in poems 7 and 9, addressed to the epic poet Ponticus, in which elegiac love poetry is compared with epic. Propertius begins 1.7 by expressing admiration for Ponticus' epic on the subject of the Seven Against Thebes, an admiration undercut to some extent by his parenthetical remark that Ponticus would rival Homer—provided the Fates would be kind to his verse: *sint modo fata tuis mollia carminibus* (1.7.4). He contrasts Ponticus' position with his own situation as a love poet:

*nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores,
atque aliquid duram quaerimus in dominam;
nec tantum ingenio quantum servire dolori
cogor et aetatis tempora dura queri.* (5–8)

"I, as is my wont, am occupied with my love and seek something to soften a mistress's hard heart. I am compelled to serve not so much my talent as my sorrow and to complain of the harsh times of my youth."

where he does not have the freedom to serve his inspiration, but is compelled to complain of the difficulties of his age. Nevertheless, the type of poetry Propertius writes does have its uses. First, it can serve to soften a hard mistress's heart. The use of *dura* "hard" twice in this passage, with reference to his own poetry, contrasts with the *mollia fata* "soft fate" he wishes for Ponticus in 4 and is the first of a number of occasions in which the technical term connected with epic and war *durus* is applied paradoxically to elegy, and the technical term for elegiac verse *mollis* is applied to epic. The second use of elegy is that, just like epic, it can be a source of fame . . . *haec mea fama est, hinc cupio nomen carminis ire mei* (9–10) "this is my fame, from here I wish the glory of my verse to spring" and men will praise him for finding favor with a cultured mistress *me laudent doctae solum placuisse puellae* (11) "may they praise me alone for finding favor with a learned girl". Furthermore, his poetry will be of use to other lovers (13–14). And now comes the counter-attack. If Ponticus were to fall in love, he would cast aside his epic and long to write elegy. Propertius would be preferred to all the famous Roman writers of epic *tunc ego Romanis praeferar ingeniis* (22) "then shall I be preferred to Rome's men of genius" and would die a hero's death, idolized

by the youth of Rome (23–24). The point about the usefulness of love poetry is then illustrated in the following poem, in which Propertius' verse entreaties are shown to have been successful in preventing Cynthia from traveling to Illyria with a rich suitor:

*hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis,
sed potui blandi carminis obsequio.
sunt igitur Musae, neque amanti tardus Apollo,
quis ego fretus amo: Cynthia rara mea est!* (1.8.39–42)

"Not with gold, not with Indian pearls could I sway her, but with the homage of beguiling verse. So, then, the Muses exist and Apollo is not slow to help a lover; in these, as I love, I put my trust: peerless Cynthia is mine!"

In the following poem, 1.9, Ponticus, it appears, has fallen in love and this allows Propertius to expand more forcibly on the relative merits of elegy and epic in such a situation:

*quid tibi nunc misero prodest graue dicere carmen
aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae?
plus in amore ualet Mimnermi uersus Homero:
carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor.* (1.9.9–12)

"What use is it to you now, poor wretch, to declaim your grand song and to weep for the wall built by Amphion's lyre? In love Mimnermus' verse is worth more than Homer's. Peaceful love demands gentle poems."

where love elegy, as exemplified by one of its first exponents, the seventh-century Mimnermus of Colophon, is of more value than the poetry of the first epic writer, Homer.

The emphasis in Book I, then, is on the "usefulness" of elegy for those who have fallen in love.³¹ Epic is not rejected as being essentially worse, but only as being inappropriate for the lover.

Book 2 opens with the statement that it is not the Muses or Apollo (in contrast with 1.8.41 quoted above) but Cynthia herself who inspires Propertius' verse:

*non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo.
ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.* (2.1.3–4)

"It is not Calliope nor Apollo who sings these songs to me. My mistress herself provides my inspiration."

³¹ On this aspect of Propertius' poetry, see Strohm (1971).

In a reference back to the elegy/epic comparison of Book 1, he now claims that Cynthia's naked beauty can inspire him to compose whole Iliads:

*seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu,
tum uero longas condimus Iliadas.* (2.1.13–14)

"Or if she wrestles with me naked, her dress snatched away, then indeed I compose long Iliads."

This leads into a subtle *recusatio* addressed to Maecenas, in which in the form of a *praeteritio* he mentions all the epic subjects he would not write on, if the fates had given him the power to compose in that genre, and excuses himself for not having the ability to write even on his chosen epic topic of the deeds of Augustus and Maecenas himself. In the first of a number of increasingly direct comparisons between himself and Callimachus, he states that he could no more sing of Augustus' ancestry than Callimachus could write a Gigantomachy:

*sed neque Phlegraeos Iouis Enceladique tumultus
intonet angusto pectore Callimachus,
nec mea conueniunt duro praecordia uersu
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos.* (2.1.39–42)

"But neither would the narrow breast of Callimachus suffice to thunder forth the conflicts between Jove and Enceladus waged on Phlegra's plain, nor does it suit my heart to trace back in epic verse the name of Caesar to his Phrygian ancestors."

Poem 2.3 continues the poetic themes of 2.1. Propertius had tried in vain to devote himself to more serious studies (7), but had produced instead a second, *alter*, book of elegies:

*uix unum potes, infelix, requiescere mensem,
et turpis de te iam liber alter erit.* (2.3.3–4)

"You can scarcely keep quiet for one month, poor wretch, and already there is to be a second scandalous book about you."

Cynthia is still his inspiration, but the new point here is that in contrast to 2.1.5–16 it is not so much her physical charms *nec me tam facies, quamuis sit candida, cepit* (2.3.9) "it was not so much her face, beautiful though it be, that snared me" as her intellectual gifts, bestowed on her by the gods *caelestia munera* (2.3.25) "celestial gifts", namely her skills in dancing, singing, and verse composition (17–22) that Propertius now finds most captivating.

The poetic themes of poems 2.1 and 2.3 are picked up and reversed in poems 2.10 and 2.11, poems which Lyne³² has argued could well have concluded an original Book 2, before an original Book 3 opened with our poem 2.12. Poem 10 opens with an apparent desire to turn from elegy to epic:

*Sed tempus lustrare aliis Helicon choreis,
et campum Haemonio iam dare tempus equo.
iam libet et fortis memorare ad proelia turmas
et Romana mei dicere castra ducis.* (2.10.1–4)

“But now it is time to circle Helicon with other dances, now it is time to give the Haemonian horse the field. Now I am eager to recall the squadrons valiant in battle and to tell of my leader’s Roman camp.”

Here Haemonian = Thessalian and suggests the epic horses of Achilles (cf. 2.3.38).³³ For the use of the horse as an image for composition we may compare Virg. *Georg.* 2.542 *et iam tempus equum fumantia soluere colla* “and now is the time to unyoke our horses’ sweating necks”. Immediately in the lines that follow, however, this bold proposal is undercut. His strength may fail him, but simply to have wished to undertake such poetry is worthy of praise (5–6). Nevertheless, the time has come for him to move on from love poetry to war, since he has finished writing about his mistress, *quando scripta puella mea est* (8) “since my girl has been written about”. The phrase suggests that poetry inspired by his mistress, the inspiration of his first and (original) second books, will now cease to be his subject. After an address to the Pierid Muses to prepare themselves for a great work *magni nunc erit oris opus* (12) “now a mighty voice will be needed”, Propertius launches into an example of the sort of epic he could write (13–18) on the victories of Augustus in Parthia, India, Arabia, and the furthest reaches of the Empire. But work on this scale is to be a project for the future (19–20) . . . *uates tua castra canendo/magnus ero: seruent hunc mihi fata diem* “a mighty bard shall I become by singing of your camp; may fate keep this day for me.”

An image of ascent dominates the last three couplets of the poem. Like a man who wishes to place a garland on the head of a statue, but has to be content with putting it on the base, Propertius has not yet reached the summit of Mount Helicon, nor even the springs

³² Lyne (1998a).

³³ Lyne (1998c) 23.

of Ascra, but Love has simply washed his verses in the stream of Permessus.³⁴ The imagery, as set out in detail by Lyne,³⁵ derives ultimately from the scene of poetic initiation of Gallus, as described in Virgil *Eclogue* 6.64–72. From this it appears that in his poem on the Grynean grove Gallus pictured himself being led up from the river Permessus (at the base of Helicon) to the summit of Helicon by the Muses. Whereas in Gallus' case this ascent was successful, Propertius remains at the springs of Permessus (love poetry); he has not yet reached the Ascræan springs (a reference to Hesiod's initiation at the spring of Hippocrene and standing here for Callimachean aetiological poetry).

This theme of progressing from elegy to more elevated verse is continued, as Lyne shows,³⁶ in poem 11. Whereas in the traditional *recusatio* the poet claims he is fit only for love poetry and leaves to others the composition of epic, poem 11 constitutes a reverse *recusatio* in that it leaves to others the task of writing of Cynthia *scribant de te alii* (2.11.1) "let others write about you". Furthermore, this is now described as a thankless task *laudet, qui sterili semina ponit humo* (11.2) "let him praise you who sows his seed in barren ground", since all her endowments that in 2.3 were described as immortal gifts from the gods *haec tibi contulerunt caelestia munera diui* (25) "the gods have bestowed upon you these heavenly gifts" are now described as mortal and perishable:

*omnia, crede mihi, tecum uno munera lecto
auferet extremi funeris atra dies.* (2.11.3–4)

"Believe me, in the end the dark day of your funeral will carry away all your gifts with you on one bier."

The poem or fragment ends with a reference to a passing traveler, who, seeing Cynthia's tomb, would not say "this dust was once a learned maid"

*et tua transibit contemnens ossa uiator,
nec dicet "Cinis hic docta puella fuit."* (2.11.5–6)

"And the traveler will pass by your bones unheeding and will never say: 'These ashes were once a learned girl.'"

³⁴ For the humor inherent in this reference, see Lyne (1998c) 27.

³⁵ Lyne (1998a) 26.

³⁶ Lyne (1998a) 28ff.

There is a clear contrast here with the immortal fame Propertius had promised her in his verse and with the epitaph of Propertius himself at the end of 2.1, where the great Maecenas passes Propertius' grave and comments: "*Huic misero fatum dura puella fuit*" (2.1.78) "A harsh girl was the death of this poor man". Of course, by writing the words "*Cinis hic docta puella fuit*" "These ashes were once a learned girl" into his poem Propertius has in fact preserved her memory.³⁷

In fact the program proposed in 2.10 and 2.11 does not materialize. In 2.13 Love bids Propertius to stay in the grove of Ascræ so that Cynthia should marvel at his verse (3–6). Here, unlike 2.10.25 where Ascræ seemed to refer to aetiological poetry, the reference is simply to elegy. Perhaps elegy is now seen to have a status that it had not achieved in 2.10.25.³⁸ Love poetry and Cynthia continue as the subject of numerous poems, and in 2.25 Propertius is still claiming that his mistress will find immortality in his poems: *ista meis fiet notissima forma libellis* (3) "that beauty of yours will be made world-famous by my books". The same point is made at the end in the last lines of our second book:

*Cynthia quin uiuet uersu laudata Properti,
hos inter si me ponere Fama uolet.* (2.34.93–94)

"Cynthia, praised in the verses of Propertius, shall live, if Fame consents to place me among such poets as these."

where *hos* in 94 refers to the famous Latin love poets Varro of Atax, Catullus, Calvus, and Gallus in whose number Propertius wishes to be included. He will leave to Virgil the singing of an epic that will prove greater than the Iliad (61–66).

Support for the idea, first proposed by Lachmann in his edition of 1816, that our present Book 2 was originally two books comes in a much-discussed reference at 2.13 where Propertius speaks of there being three books in his funeral procession:

*sat mea sit magni, si tres sint pompa libelli,
quos ego Persephona maxima dona feram.* (25–26)

"My funeral procession will be costly enough if it consists of three books for me to present to Persephone as my finest gift."

³⁷ Lyne (1998a) 35.

³⁸ See Camps (1967) *ad loc.*

The simplest interpretation would be to take these words at face value to mean that when Propertius wrote this couplet he was engaged on the composition of his third book. Such a reference would fit well near the beginning of an original Book 3, just as the reference to *liber alter* "a second book" in 2.3.4 (quoted above) is well suited to its position near the beginning of an original Book 2.

The implication of these expressions is that our second book consists of part of an original second book (our poems 2.1–2.11, with other material perhaps now missing) together with a third book (2.12–2.34). The original Book 2 started with emphasis in poems 2.1 and 2.3 on Cynthia as the poet's inspiration and ended with a proposed change to epic themes (2.10) and a refusal to continue with elegy (2.11). This project does not, however, immediately take shape and the aim of his poetry in the original Book 3 remains the immortalization of his mistress.

With the beginning of our Book 3 there is a change in emphasis in Propertian poetics from a stress on Cynthia as the source of his inspiration to an expression of the poet's desire to follow in the footsteps of two illustrious Hellenistic Greek elegiac poets Callimachus and Philetas:

*Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in uestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Italia per Graios orgia ferre choros.* (3.1.1–4)

"Shade of Callimachus and sacred rites of Coan Philetas, allow me, I pray, to enter your grove. I enter as the first priest from a pure spring to bring Italian mysteries in Greek dances."

These two poets had first been mentioned in advice to Lynceus at 2.34.31–32:

*tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan
et non inflati somnia Callimachi.*

"It would be better for you to imitate learned Philetas in your poems and the dream of refined Callimachus."

The context was that Lynceus, like Ponticus in 1.9, had recently fallen in love and was being advised to give up philosophical studies in favor of writing elegy. The two poets in question represent the best Greek exponents of narrative elegy (so Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58). The "dream" of Callimachus refers to the prologue to his aetiological

work the *Aitia*, in which the poem describes being transported to Mount Helicon where he receives instruction from the Muses. Both poets were exponents of the “refined” (*non inflati*) style of writing, and though neither, as far as we know, wrote subjective elegies like those of Propertius to Cynthia, their works did concern themselves to some extent with love, and Callimachus’ prologues and epilogues contained personal biographical material. In the opening of 3.1 Propertius is taking up a serious pose as a priest of the Muses. The grove which he symbolically enters represents the poetic inspiration of Callimachus and Philetas, and the sacral imagery represents Propertius’ claim to be introducing for the first time to a Roman context a literary form established by these prestigious Greek predecessors. The context of this claim is that of a *recusatio*. Under pressure, perhaps, from Maecenas to produce an Augustan epic, Propertius no longer claims, as in Book 1, that as a love poet he has no choice but to write elegy, nor does he claim, as in 2.10 and 2.11, that he is about to give up elegy for greater things; but rather he now fully associates himself with Callimachus and Philetas and, using Callimachean imagery, suggests that well-written elegy is just as worthwhile as epic and just as likely to make its poet famous after death.

a ualeat, Phoebum quicumque moratur in armis!
exactus tenui pumice uersus eat,—
quo me Fama leuat terra sublimis . . . (3.1.7–9)

“Ah, farewell the man who detains Phoebus in arms. Let my verse run smoothly, polished with fine pumice and through it may soaring Fame raise me above the earth . . .”

The images of slender verse, pure water, the narrow road, the envious rival, are, as all the commentators have shown, purely Callimachean, derived mainly from the *Aitia* prologue (fr. 1.17–21) and the conclusion to the *Hymn to Apollo* (105–12). This proud validation of elegy leads in poem 3.2 to a return to Propertius’ role as a writer of verse to please (3.2.2) and immortalize (3.2.17–18) his mistress. The traditional *recusatio* theme continues in 3.3, where Propertius reports a dream consisting of two parts. In the first he is on Mount Helicon, contemplating an epic on Roman history, when he is interrupted by Apollo, who warns him to keep to his own sphere of poetry and directs him to the grotto of the Muses. In the second part the grotto is described, and Calliope delivers a speech in which she repeats Apollo’s advice that Propertius should keep to love poetry (37–52). Again the themes of the dream and the advice of the Muses

(Call. fr. 7.19f.), as well as the intervention of Apollo (Call. fr. 1.22ff., cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 6.2ff.), are derived from Callimachus' *Aitia*. At the end of the poem the epic fountain of Bellerophon, with which the poem began (lines 2, 5), is replaced by the water of Philetas, with which Calliope sprinkles Propertius' lips. It comes as some surprise, then, that poem 3.4 begins with an epic flourish, describing Augustus' plans for a campaign against the East; but this elevated tone is soon undercut at 15ff. by the statement that Propertius' role will be restricted to watching any subsequent triumph in the arms of his mistress. In 3.5 the values of the life of action are rejected as being based on greed (1–18); Propertius himself will continue as a love poet, until, with the onset of old age, he will devote himself to the study of natural philosophy (19–46).

The mention of Propertius' patron Maecenas, which is delayed in Book 3 until poem 9, now becomes the occasion for a full-blown *recusatio* poem. Propertius excuses himself from writing epic (1–4) on the grounds first of all of his own poetic limitations (5–20), but secondly by reference to the self-restraint so admirably exemplified by Maecenas himself. Once again it is to Callimachus and Philetas that Propertius appeals as his models in elegiac poetry:

*inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos
et cecinisse modis, Coe poeta, tuis.* (3.9.43–4)

"It will be enough to have given pleasure along with the books of Callimachus and to have sung, Coan poet, strains like yours."

This position is undercut to some extent in 47–56, where Propertius adds the rider that he would be prepared to write on epic topics if Maecenas were to give him the lead; but from 21–34 it is clear that this will not be the case.

In fact, when the revered Italian Muses, the *Camenae*, make an appearance at the beginning of the next poem, 3.10.1–4, their role is to inspire not a national epic, but an elegy on his mistress's birthday. Finally in 3.17, a poem that anticipates his freedom from slavery to Cynthia celebrated in the final poem of the book, 3.25, Propertius imagines himself honoring Bacchus with a poetic tribute, if the god is able to free him from the torment of love. The type of poetry imagined is partly (21–28) legends associated with Bacchus and partly (29–38) a depiction in elevated Pindaric style:

*haec ego non humili referam memoranda coturno,
qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat.* (3.17.39–40)

“Of these things shall I tell, to be recalled in no humble style, but with such a voice as thundered from Pindar’s lips.”

of the god being honored with music and sacrifice.

In Book 3, then, Propertius is more confident about his status as an elegiac poet in the tradition of Callimachus and Philetas. When love has come to an end he would be willing to turn to philosophical subjects (3.5) or to celebratory poetry in the style of Pindar (3.17), but his position on epic is now consistent. This is not the genre for him.

Confidence in his own poetic abilities and pride in his elegiac achievement reaches its climax in Propertius’ fourth book. If Book 3 had begun with a wish to follow the poetic inspiration of Callimachus and Philetas (3.1.1–6), by the opening of Book 4 this has become a desire to be the Roman Callimachus:

*ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Vmbria libris,
Vmbria Romani patria Callimachi.* (4.1.63–64)

“That Umbria may swell with pride at my books, Umbria, the home of the Roman Callimachus.”

Later on in the book, Callimachean inspiration is to allow Propertius not only to follow in the footsteps of Philetas, but actually to become his rival:

*serta Philiteis certet Romana corymbis,
et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas.* (4.6.3–4)

“Let the Roman garland rival the ivy crown of Philetas, and may the urn serve me with the water of Cyrene.”

An analysis of the contexts in which these statements are made will clarify Propertius’ concept of his own poetry as it emerges in Book 4. The first elegy of Book 4, from which the first quotation above is taken, consists of two parts: lines 1–70 spoken by the poet and lines 71–150 spoken by the astrologer Horus. The greater part of 1–70, inspired by Tibullus 2.5.22–64, is taken up with a description of early Rome (1–38) and the arrival of the Trojans, the forerunners of the great heroes of Rome (39–56). It is at this point that the poet makes his statement about his own poetic intentions (57–64). The imagery again is Callimachean. His voice is weak: *parvus in ore sonus* (58) “weak is the sound in my mouth”, but he will put the pure stream of his inspiration *exiguo quodcumque e pectore riui/fluxerit*

(59–60) “whatever stream flows from my slender heart” at the service of his country. He rejects Ennian epic and states his wish to be the Roman Callimachus (61–64). The section ends, if we accept the transposition of lines 87–88 as printed by most editors, with a statement of the form this Callimachean poetry is to take:

dicam: “Troia, cades, et Troica Roma resurges;” 87
et maris et terrae longa sepulcra canam; 88
sacra diisque canam et cognomina prisca locorum: 69
has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus 70

“I will sing ‘Troy you shall fall, and as Roman Troy you shall rise again’, and I will tell of distant burials by land and sea. Of holy rites and their days shall I sing and of the ancient names of places, this is the goal to which my steeds must sweat.”

The poetic prophecies on the fall of Troy and the rise of Rome, as advertised in 87–88, do not materialize, except in the earlier part of the present poem, but the Roman aetiological poetry proposed in 69–70 does provide material for half the poems in the book. The second half of the poem begins with a warning from Horus that Apollo and the Fates are against this proposed poetic programme (71–74). This pattern is reminiscent of Book 3 poem 3, in which Propertius’ dream of epic composition is shattered by the warning from Apollo and the Muses to keep to elegy. The rest of Horus’ speech is taken up with his qualifications as a seer (75–118), and a detailed horoscope of Propertius (119–50) giving biographical details of the poet, which end with a reference to his slavery to one mistress and a warning to keep to elegy *at tu finge elegos, fallax opus—haec tua castra* (135) “but you compose elegy, a tricky work—this is your camp”. In fact, the content of Book 4 reflects a compromise between Propertius’ proposed program of the first half of 4.1 and Horus’ advice in the second. Of the ten remaining poems of the book, five (2, 4, 6, 9, and 10) are aetiological in content, reflecting Propertius’ proposal at 69–70, and five are on subjects concerned with love: 3 Arethusa’s letter to Lycotas, 7 the return of Cynthia’s ghost, 8 Cynthia bursting in on Propertius’ party, and 11 the speech of the dead Cornelia to her husband L. Aemilius Paullus.

The second reference to Callimachus comes in 4.6.3–4 (quoted above) where Propertius expresses his wish to rival Philetas and to follow the model of Callimachus. Poem 4.6 is an aetiological elegy on the origins of the temple of Palatine Apollo, seen here as a thank-offering

for Apollo's help to Augustus in the battle of Actium. The central section of the poem (lines 15–66) is taken up with a narrative of the battle of Actium, but emphasis on Callimachean inspiration is particularly appropriate at the start of this poem (1–10), where the poet speaks in the person of a priest officiating at an act of worship. The inspiration for this goes back ultimately to Callimachus *Hymns* 2 (to Apollo) and 5 (the Bath of Pallas), although it had been used earlier in Latin poetry by Horace in *Odes* 3.1 and by Tibullus in poems 2.1 and 2.5. All of these earlier poems have left their mark on Propertius' treatment, but the influence of Callimachus *Hymn* 2 is particularly marked, and a detailed list of reminiscences is discussed in Boucher.³⁹ Views on the success of this poem differ, but as an exercise in adapting potentially epic material to the elegiac meter it is something of a *tour de force* and it can be seen as a good example of the type of aetiological poetry proposed by Propertius in 4.1.69–70.

By Book 4, then, Propertius has achieved full confidence in his Callimachean and Philetan poetic credentials. There is no need for him to change genres from elegy to epic; elegy itself can be used as a vehicle for historical and aetiological themes as well as for more traditional erotic topics. Propertius claims no longer simply to be following in the footsteps of his Greek elegiac predecessors but to be the Roman Callimachus and a rival to Philetas.

Conclusion

Certain developments in the handling of these major themes stand out clearly. As the nature of Propertian elegy changes over the four books from a concentration in the monobiblos on personal erotic experience, through a broadening of the elegiac themes in Books 2 and 3, to a more objective stance in Book 4, so the relative importance of the various themes changes. In the first book the writing of subjective elegy has to be defended on the grounds of its usefulness to other lovers, and so the *praeceptor amoris* theme dominates. This decreases in importance as the range and variety of subject matter broadens in the second and third books, and by the fourth

³⁹ Boucher (1965) 199.

book the theme is entirely absent. Conversely, as Propertius' confidence in his role as an elegiac poet increases, the discussion of poetics takes on a more important function, reaching its climax in Book 4 where Propertius takes on the role of the Roman Callimachus.

In comparison with the other elegists Propertius has been shown to be much more aware of the visual dimensions of his subject. Death, though an important theme in all the elegists, assumes an overriding significance in Propertius and is present throughout the collection. The same can be said for the *seruitium amoris* theme which, at least in the early books, takes on an importance far greater than that found in the other elegists. At a more detailed level certain features have been identified as characteristically Propertian. The most striking of these are the use of aphorisms connected with Amor as a feature of the *praeceptor* theme and the interest in the technical aspects of medical language and teaching in relation to the theme of love as a disease.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE IMAGE OF WOMAN IN PROPERTIUS' POETRY

Elaine Fantham

Perceptions of the sexual and social roles of women have changed radically in Western cultures over the last forty years, and with them the nature of our interest in women in ancient literature and life. In 1965 Lilja's monograph on the elegists' attitudes toward women was a useful first step, but it disappointed by attempting too much, and by dissipating its energies on attitudes not toward women or a woman, but toward the alternative relationships of free love and marriage. In Propertius' case Cynthia was still treated as reality; or at least fictionalized reality; hence the useful formulation of Lieberg (1963): inspiration, subject and intended addressee, "zugleich Quelle, Gegenstand und Ziel" of Propertius' elegiac poetry, and the vivid recreation of the poet's mistress in the climactic twelfth chapter of Boucher (1965).

Then came a critical move to separate literature from life, with concentration on the poet's processes: Veyne (1983) reinterpreted the loved woman as a mere reflection of the poet lover's self-image, followed by Wyke (1987a, b; 1989) for whom Cynthia passed from being the poet's subject to a "form of literary language," or "of poetic production," (1987a, 53) on which the elegist could exercise his Callimachean stylistic ambitions. Dispute over the fictionality or instrumentality of "Cynthia" distracted from the primary study of how she was represented and how she was treated as representative of her sex. The elegist's attitude is important because Propertius himself shows so much interest in his contradictory reactions. As the shrewd slave told young Phaedria in Terence *Eunuchus*, "you can't control [Love] by reasoning, since it knows no reason or restraint."¹ But where comedy could correct the prejudiced views of the distressed lover on his woman, or on women, through the wiser judgments of

¹ *Eun.* 57-8 *Quae res in se neque consilium neque modum / habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes.*

unaffected characters, elegy speaks only through the elegist and can only fully represent the woman by also representing the poet's own emotions: Lilja saw that "Propertius emphasizes the irrational nature of love" (1965, 115), he "underlines his own . . . feelings of inferiority, . . . is suspicious . . . over-sensitive, . . . jealous" (159). He expects his public to assess his statements for themselves.

The purpose of this essay is to go beyond the poet's complex portrait of Cynthia to isolate his views of her sex: that is, of sexually active women, whose behavior he generalizes either by extending Cynthia's faults to reproach her contemporaries, or by invoking the idealized women of other, mythical or bucolic² worlds as parallels to her beauty or foils to her offenses. But one must start, as Propertius did, with Cynthia herself.

The first book of elegies opens with the name of Cynthia, and with his own relationship of longing and submission to her: she is the woman desired, cruel and unyielding, like Atalanta (1.1.10 *saevitiam durae . . . Iasidos*),³ because she imposes demands on the man who seeks to be her lover. The lover-poet defines women in terms of their desirability and response to his desire, and for most of the *Monobiblos* we learn little about Cynthia and her circumstances, except in terms of her physical charms (defined in 1.2 as needing no unnatural enhancement) and the poet's frustration from gratifying his passion. This book confines itself within a tight male circle (Tullus, Gallus, Bassus, Ponticus)—themselves introduced in terms of their misguided indifference to love (Ponticus, 1.7, reversed in 1.9), their criticism of Cynthia (Bassus 1.4), or jealous attempts to seduce her (Gallus 1.5). Praise of Cynthia is combined with the exaltation of sexual delight, as Venus is treated with awe for her power to humble mighty heroes and cause pain to unyielding hearts (1.14.17–18: *illa potest magnas heroum infringere vires, / illa etiam duris mentibus esse dolor*). Apart from varying Cynthia's circumstances, such as her plan to travel away from Propertius to Illyricum or her escape to Baiae (1.8; 1.11), Propertius depicts her only in terms of the pangs of desire she causes. Indeed the last poem to focus upon her (1.19) does so through the poet's protests of love beyond death: he claims for himself the

² Propertius' use of myth explored by Boucher (1965) will be discussed below. For the bucolic alternative, compare 2.34.67–76 (Virgil's *Eclogues*) and 3.13.25–40.

³ The text will normally be cited from Fedeli (1984), with reference where there is significant divergence to Barber (1960) and Goold (1990).

role of dead Protesilaos, although Laodamia's grief over her unconsummated marriage and attempts to mould a substitute for her husband was an equally well-known aspect of the myth; it is the man's emotions that matter.

There are other women in this collection. Gallus' unidentified beloved is mentioned incidentally in 1.10 and 1.13 as Propertius gives him advice based on his personal experience: Gallus should not provoke her when she is angry, or speak arrogantly, or sulk in silence, or refuse any gift she asks for, or let her kind words fall in vain. If she is treated with contempt she will be annoyed and take offense, reluctant to abandon her threats: any man who wants to stay happy with a single girl can never again be free in heart (1.10.21–30). The same assumptions, that women are emotional creatures who must be humored, recur when Propertius moves in 1.13 from generalizations about the pains of love to a voyeuristic report of the passionate mutual embrace of Gallus and his girl, comparable to the mythical lovemaking of Poseidon/Enipeus and Hercules with Tyro, daughter of Salmoneus, and the divine Hebe. The women are indeed named, but it is the gods' fulfilled desires (*facili amore*, 22; *gaudia prima*, 24) that are the point of comparison between his ordinary young friends and heroic mythology. In contrast, infidelity to Propertius disqualifies Cynthia from consideration alongside the heroines of *Odyssey*, *Argonautica*, and Euripidean tragedy, although her failure seems to consist only in being slow to come to him when he is sick (1.15.13). Her fickleness and broken oaths (*levitas*, *periuria*) have betrayed him: she has failed to match the heroines and become a glorious legend, and she will suffer for it.

Only one elegy in this book is focused on a woman from outside Propertius' circle. In the tradition of Catullus' poem 67 the speaker is the door of a patrician mansion, which contrasts the present disgrace brought on by a promiscuous mistress to the noble tradition of masculine victories and feminine Chastity,⁴ and the tears of foreign captives led in triumph are replaced by obscene epigrams and the suppliant laments of the excluded lover. The context and positive family ideology that sets the scene for this elegy will return in

⁴ *Pudicitia* is the fidelity expected of the married woman, her equivalent of her husband's military *virtus*. It was an early object of cult (Treggiari 1991, 105–7, 232–37) but since Propertius sanctifies his relationship with Cynthia as a kind of marriage, he repeatedly calls for her to be *pudica* and holds her to *pudicitia*.

its opposite (4.11); the imagined self-defense before the infernal judges of the dead Cornelia, descendant of the triumph-loaded Cornelia Scipiones, and daughter of Augustus' ex-wife Scribonia. But like the mistress of the house in Catullus 67, this wife is indifferent to her reputation (*famae* 11).⁵ She is clearly an adulteress (is her husband indifferent, or absent?), and the thirty lines of reproach (1.16.17–46) sung by the excluded lover make it clear that he, like Propertius, is indignant because she is lying in the lucky arms of another man (33). Exclusion is painful and he is ashamed to lie on her threshold; but he would not be ashamed if he had been invited into her bed. The door has one standard of honor and shame (cf. *turpior*), the lover a different standard based purely on pride in male conquest, not of Rome's enemies, but of the desired woman. Surely here in impersonating the door, which has the last word, condemning its lustful mistress and the lover's endless laments, Propertius is passing judgment on his own world? If there is any difference, it is in the woman's status: Propertius never represents Cynthia as another man's wife, but in Catullan fashion sets up a distinction between the fidelity she owes to his own loyal love and her preference for any other lover, which is seen as faithless if not also mercenary.

Now Propertius has set up the paradigms for his one-on-one devotion to Cynthia (1.12.19–20 "It is not right for me to love any other, or cease to love her: Cynthia was the first love and will be the last" *mi nec amare aliam neque ab hac desistere fas est; Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit*) it is time to look beyond Cynthia to the poet's statements and assumptions about other women. In the three later books of elegies there are in moral terms two kinds of "other women": virtuous and faithful wives or partners, almost always set back in the context of Greek legend, and the mass of easily won "modern" women, who will receive the most violent abuse in the third book, which also depicts the fading of Propertius' own love.

What we have as the second book is both the most discontinuous and the most complex of his books; it is almost certainly a fusion of two previous collections, with a second beginning at 2.10 *sed tempus lustrare aliis Helicon choreis*.⁶ But there are two other recurring

⁵ For 1.16.9, *infamis* . . . *noctes*, "her nights of shame," Goold prefers Housman's *voces*, "Shaming rumors."

⁶ This was first seen by Lachmann; cf. Hubbard (1974), and Goold (1990) 11–12.

problems: a lack of boundaries between elegies where the argument seems to continue beyond the inherited manuscript divisions, and an excess of disruptions where topics or addressees change abruptly within poems, being connected neither with what precedes nor what follows.⁷ While the volume begins by reaffirming the poet's enslavement to Cynthia and evoking her beauty and talents, it soon adds a broader context to the intimate world of Book 1 by applying directly and indirectly to Cynthia the circumstances of the professional but high-class Greek *hetaera* known to Romans from Plautus' and Terence's adaptations of Menandrian and other New Comedies.⁸ As the third elegy of Book 1 compared the sleeping Cynthia to three different mythological figures (Ariadne, Andromeda and an exhausted maenad) so the sixth elegy of Book 2 compares Cynthia to the notorious Lais of Corinth, Athenian Phryne (creatures of real life) and the literary Thais of Menander, for the crowds of admirers thronging her home. She will be assimilated to a *hetaera* in this and several other extended elegies of Book 2. This is a household of women: courtesans were mostly daughters of other courtesans by unknown or casual fathers, so Cynthia has a mother and sister and girlfriend (2.3.26, 2.6.11–12) but no brother or even son (2.18.33–34) to act as her moral guardian. It is also a house adorned with provocative pictures (*iuvenum pictae facies, obscenae tabellae, turpia . . . visa* 2.6.9 and 27–28) like the wall painting of Jupiter and Danae in the courtesan's house of Ter. *Eun.* 583–90: indeed Propertius will represent himself in the situation of the poor young lover Phaedria in that highly successful play, excluded when the rich soldier who is his rival returns. Terence's Thais has an unselfish motive for entertaining the

⁷ On "emotional incoherence" and shifts of mood within the elegies of Book 2, see Hubbard (1974) 63, La Penna (1977) 53–54, 65–66: on the book's discontinuous nature, see Goold (1990) 11–12 and 22. To illustrate from poems discussed below, Barber and Fedeli print 2.9 as one elegy (with a lacuna after 48); 2.18 is printed as three units (1–4, 5–22, 23–38) by Barber, two (1–22, 23–38) by Fedeli, and four by (1–4, 5–20, 21–22, 23–38) Goold; 2.24 divided by Barber into two (1–16, 17–52) but has three parts in Fedeli (1–10, 11–16, 17–52), while Goold assigns 1–10 to the end of 2.23. La Penna (1977) 60 sees 2.28 as a cycle of three elegies. Where Barber and Fedeli print 2.32.1–62 as a single elegy, Goold has fused 31 and 32, transposing 32.7–10 before 32.1.

⁸ For the courtesan's world, compare Plautus *Cistellaria* (= Menander *Synaristosae*), and *Truculentus*, as well as Terence *Eunuchus*, based largely on Menander's play of the same name. The Thais of 2.6.3 and 4.5.53 is not Terence's heroine (called Chrysis in Menander's play) but the title character of the lost *Thais*.

soldier, but for Propertius Cynthia's welcoming of the Praetor from Illyricum (2.16)⁹ is purely mercenary. She is not impressed by his rank, only his purse and his luxury gifts: *Cynthia non sequitur fasces nec curat honores; semper amatorum ponderat una sinus*. The world of the courtesan was one of drinking parties or tête-à-têtes with lovers (2.9.23–24); they were *venales amicae* (2.16) asking for gifts of jewels and purple cloth (2.16.17–18), accepting robes and emeralds (16.43–44; cf. the fragment 2.24a 1–6 “now she asks for peacock-tail fans and marble balls to cool her hands, for ivory dice and the gifts that glitter on the Sacred Way.”)¹⁰

This was also a world of promenades in Pompey's portico and gardens (2.32.3–14) and pleasure excursions with young admirers outside Rome to Lavinium (as in the retrospective 4.8), to Aricia and Tibur and Praeneste. This representation of Cynthia as a courtesan never names her livelihood, and while the many elegies in Book 2 concerned with rival lovers can be read in terms of hired sex, protests like 2.9.17: “you could not even spend a single night alone” (*at tu non una potuisti nocte vacare*) can as easily be read as indictments of her fickleness or greed¹¹ as of outright lust. A group of later elegies (21–25) sets out the standard choices of sexual partner available to young unmarried men in a kind of debate between options: in 2.22 the poet will henceforward divide his attention between two or more girls, rather than suffer frustration (cf. 2.22.43–50 for the pain of a cancelled rendezvous and the humiliation of importing slaves to get access to the beloved courtesan); 2.23 returns to this image of futile pursuit and expensive nights (23.8–12) contrasting it with the easy accosting of girls walking dusty-footed and with cloak thrown back along the Sacred Way (13–17). Gratification is instant and inexpensive, without the terrors of courting a married woman who will panic at the sounds of her husband returning from the family farmstead. Foreign girls from Syria are good enough to please him (19–22), and he proudly rejects the oxymoron and transferred epithet *furta pudica tori*, “stealthy couplings with the mate of a chaste bed.” What Propertius sets out here was conventional enough;

⁹ She has slept with him for seven nights (2.16.23–24). But Propertius' reference is uncomfortably specific; there would only have been one praetorian governor of Illyricum in any given year; were his readers intended to identify the fellow?

¹⁰ On these lovers' gifts (*munera*), see Boucher (1965) 448–49.

¹¹ *Vacare* almost suggests an empty slot in an appointment book.

Horace had made the same point a decade earlier in *Satires* 1.2, recommending the casual prostitute over either adultery or expensive and demanding mistresses (cf. Williams 1968, 529). Propertius' summary in what may be the next elegy, *parcius infamant*: (2.24.10), shifts ground to defend his reputation (whether for virtue or sexual success) against a friend's reproaches: it is because Cynthia has deceived him and turned him away that he is now seeking cheap women.

This pattern of assimilating Cynthia to professional courtesans is quite consistent with elegies in that she sends out slave *Erotes* by night to bring him to her house, or he decides to spy out her activities in the early morning (2.29a and b) or with his interrogation of their go-between Lygdamus in 3.6. If we are to imagine a woman ineligible for marriage it is not surprising that the poet sees any pressure to marry as necessarily a betrayal of Cynthia, but there are other elegies that seem by implication to associate her with marital infidelity and his descriptions of her education and high birth (Boucher 1965, 456–57) are incompatible with the foreign or freedwomen status of courtesans.¹²

The elegist's many allusions to mythical heroines in this book can be divided into evocation of their beauty and desirability, with no moral to be drawn, and the moralizing concern with the heroines as exempla, in their relationships to men, and almost exclusively to their roles as good and bad wives. In what is still the most illuminating discussion Boucher (1965, 227–68) has noted that for all his Hellenistic expertise, Propertius draws largely on the classic heroines of Homer tragedy and Apollonius; these would be what his public had read or heard or seen, so that a phrase or even a mere epithet could evoke remembered texts or images without need for narrative. Propertius actually acknowledges the category of heroines, or women from the age of heroes, citing *Inachiüs . . . heroinis* 1.13.31, *formosae . . . chorus heroinae* 1.19.13, *Maenias omnis heroidas inter*, 2.28.29). Naturally Helen is the most celebrated object of desire; in 1.13.29–30 Cynthia's

¹² As Williams (1968) shows in his careful discussion (530–38), Propertius avoids identifying Cynthia as either a high-class *meretrix* or an adulterous wife; there are several clues that favor assuming she is, or is conceived as, a married woman like Catullus' Lesbia, but if he is writing about an actual relationship it would be indiscreet (even before the Augustan legislation of 18 BC) to reveal that it was adulterous. Griffin (1985) 1–30 esp. 26f. rightly stresses the availability of luxury courtesans in Triumviral and Augustan Rome, but a basis in contemporary reality does not exclude the adoption of motifs from literary sources like comedy.

beauty was worthy of Jove himself, equal (or near it) to Leda, or Leda's three daughters—grouping Helen and Clytemnestra with divine Artemis/Diana; 2.3.32 calls Cynthia the second beauty on earth after Helen, a worthy cause for Troy to perish, for whom Menelaus and Paris were justified in fighting; (*nunc Pari, tu sapiens, et tu, Menelae, fuisti*). Other women are exalted as objects of love, from Antiope and Hermione (1.4.5–6) to Peirithous' bride Ischomache (2.2.9) and Brimo (2.2.12).¹³ Even Antigone (2.8.21) who should surely have been honored for her own heroic deeds, is cited along with Achilles' prize captive Briseis (2.8.21) as the object of love: Briseis at least will receive her due for her devotion to Achilles in the next elegy, which describes in affecting detail (2.9.9–16) her mourning over her master's corpse. This scene outside Homer's narrative may have been described in the epic cycle, or featured in Hellenistic poetry or wall painting; Propertius may be the first Roman poet to envisage Briseis' grief, but Ovid's tender *Heroides* 3 takes the hint from Prop. 2.20.1 and recreates from her captivity by Agamemnon her expression of love for the living Achilles. It is natural that the poet should single out Penelope for her fidelity (2.6.23, obliquely named along with Alcestis as *Admeti coniunx et lectus Ulixis*, but more fully characterized in 2.9.3–6, cf. 3.12). Fidelity, the fidelity he misses in Cynthia, is the reason for his lavish praise of Aurora (2.18.7–18) for continuing to love her aging Tithonus. Other heroines are evoked either for their mourning (Procne and Niobe, both traditional, 2.20.5–8) or their roles as victims, suffering either rape or other hardship: the captives Briseis and Andromache, the imprisoned Danae (2.20.9–12) the drowned Helle and ravished Amydone and Orithyia (2.26.5 and 47–51), or the long list in 2.28 that combines victims beloved of Jove and transformed or consumed for their pains (Io, Callisto, Semele, 17–18, 23–24 and 27–28). Here Ino and Andromeda serve a different purpose; they are poignant and appealing because they have suffered, but Io and Ino became goddesses, and Andromeda was rewarded with marriage to Perseus. Their return to good fortune serves the rhetoric of this list by reassuring Cynthia that she

¹³ Ischomache is not the usual name for Peirithous' bride, and Brimo is a Hellenistic rarity, but as Boucher points out (1965), 239 and 259, Roman women of this generation were well read; we should also bear in mind their familiarity with the mythological paintings of private homes and sculpture programs of public parks like that of Pompey.

will recover from her illness, but there are two less obvious purposes: to confer on Cynthia the glamor of the heroines of old (this is the poem that names the Homeric heroines and beauties now among the dead)¹⁴ and to give his readers the pleasure of contemplating women in distress. In fact, elegy 2.28 offers the richest panorama of heroines, adding to the virtuous and victimized Antiope, Tyro and Europa (more loves of Jupiter) and the wicked Pasiphae.

For bad women have as much to contribute to the dimensions of Propertius' praise and blame as the conventional model heroines. In Book 1 only the spells of Medea represent the threats of evil women, but Books 2 and 3 will introduce all the female descendants of the Sun; not just Medea (2.4.7, cf. 3.11.9–12; 3.19.18; 4.5.41–42) who will also receive some sympathy among the list of deserted women (2.21, 11–12 and 24.43–44), but with Medea her cousin Circe, and a strange allusion to the poison (or perhaps love potions) of Phaedra (2.1.51–54). Oddly, Phaedra is not quoted for the Euripidean version of her attempt to seduce and then traduce Hippolytus, but she is found only once, in contrast to her mother Pasiphae, whose desire for the bull from the sea was both before and after Propertius the prime symbol of unnatural female lust (compare with 2.32.57, and 4.7.57–8, Virgil *Ecl.* 6.46–60, and Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 1.295–96). In several poems of Book 3 these bad examples of legendary womanhood are used cumulatively to denounce the whole sex.

But while the many positive allusions to mythical heroines together create a glamorous distant world of maidens and virtuous wives, each individually is used to make a point about, or more often against, contemporary women. Overt judgments of women come only slowly in Book 2, but appear in both 2.6 and 2.9. Elegy 6, which began with mercenary hetaerae, explodes in indignation at 25–26 against the violation of *Pudicitia* by married women: *templa Pudicitiae quid opust statuisset puellis, si cuius nuptiae quidlibet esse licet*, and 2.9 turns from the true brides, *veris . . . nuptis* of legendary Greece (ostensibly the women who loved Achilles, Briseis, and Deidamia, one a captive, the other raped and deserted), to Cynthia, who cannot stay a night without sex (2.9.17) and pursues a man who previously left her, to an apostrophe indicting all women for a series of vices first deceit: *sed vobis facilest verba et componere fraudes* (31–32), then fickleness: “the Syrtes do

¹⁴ 2.28.29 *Maeonidas omnis heroidas inter/primus erit . . . locus*, and 49–50 *sunt apud infernos tot milia formosarum, / pulchra sit in superis . . . una locis*.

not change so constantly with the shifting wind, nor are leaves so dislodged by the wintery South wind—" This turns, however, in the last couplet to a recognition that what moves women is anger:—"As a bond collapses with a woman's anger, whether the cause be serious or trivial" *non sic incerto mutantur flamine Syrtes, / nec folia hiberno tam tremefacta Noto / quam cito feminea non constat foedus in ira / sive ea causa gravis, sive ea causa levis* (33–36). Here is the Catullan ideal of the binding pledge (*foedus*) and an echo, surely, of Mercury's dismissive "woman was ever inconstant and changeable" *varium semper et mutabile femina* (*Aen.* 4.569–70).¹⁵

Other generalizations about women are less striking, but we may compare 2.18.1–4 warning the lover against constant complaining, because it often produce disgust, whereas "a woman is often broken by a man's silence" *frangitur in tacito femina saepe viro*. In Ovidian fashion the man is advised to conceal anything distressing he has seen and deny that he is pained by any cause of jealousy. Not all comments on women stress their untrustworthiness: in the cycle provoked by Cynthia's supposed infidelity, which toys with the appeal of promiscuity (2.21–25), the first elegy assumes Cynthia's latest lover is married, and pretends pity for girls too easily trusting; *ah nimium faciles aures praebere puellae, / discite desertae non temere esse bonae!* (2.21.15–16): this is reiterated in 2.24.41–42 and 49–50; many men have fallen for your beauty, Cynthia, but have not kept faith . . . do not associate¹⁶ with noble and wealthy men: scarcely one will come to gather your bones at your death. But the very next elegy 2.25 addresses her current lover, and adjusts to the new addressee and situation: "as for you, who put on airs with satisfied love, trusting fool, no woman remains stable for long," *nulla diu femina pondus habet*. The lover has not yet reached harbor, and he should be sparing in coming when called (32–33). In more moral times Propertius would even now be enjoying the lover's privilege that this intruder has taken. Then the poem veers to answer friends who have tried to console

¹⁵ Propertius' evocation of the African Syrtes (cf. also 3.19.7 discussed below) may point to *Aeneid* 4 (2.34 shows that he was already familiar with book 8); but 2.28.8 (quoted below) shows he also had in mind Catullus 70 and the proverbial saying that women's promises were written in wind and water. With women's anger, compare 3.15.44 (addressed to Cynthia): "your headlong anger does not know how to step back" *nescit vestra ruens ira referre pedem*, and 3.8.1–12 and 28 on anger as proof of a woman's love.

¹⁶ I read Damsté's *consuesse* with Goold against the Mss. *conferre* (Barber, Fedeli).

him for her desertion by recommending other women of all social categories, Greek or Italian, a working girl or one clad in luxurious scarlet. The poet answers with a different claim that vindicates return to monogamy: one woman causes the eyes enough lack of sleep; one woman is quite enough misfortune for any man.

With 2.28 Propertius returns to the attack on both Cynthia and the tribe of women, blaming Cynthia's present sickness on her perjury, then generalizing to condemn all girls for breaking their oaths and failing to treat the gods as sacred: as in 2.9.33–36 above "this is what ruins . . . wretched girls: whatever they swear the wind and water sweeps away," *hoc perdit miseras, hoc perdidit ante puellas, / quicquid iurarunt, ventus et unda rapit*.¹⁷

The argument of 2.28 echoes that of 2.9, adding only that women cannot control their tongues. In Cynthia's case pride in her beauty has combined with her hurtful tongue to bring on this illness. But given the imagined circumstances, the poet has the grace to change his tune and promise Cynthia the recovery that has come to other persecuted heroines, without further reproaches.

We have seen that Propertius regularly idealizes the noble ladies of myth and legend as models of beauty combined with innocence and virtue, and that his adverse judgments are reserved for contemporary women. Yet in 2.9 and 2.28 women's perjury is not just recent; it has always been their ruin. In 2.6 and 2.25 the poet had preserved a contrast between past virtue and present corruption: 2.6 acknowledges that male desire had fomented rape since the centaurs violated Peirithous' wedding feast, before even Paris carried off Helen, or Romulus the Sabine women. But he seems to imply a time-lag before the corruption of women: the rape of the Sabines taught male Love to dare all. Later, it would seem (2.6.25) a shrine of chastity was set up for girls, but to what end? It was fruitless since now any bride may do as she chooses, corrupted by the art of erotic painting; once (*olim*) walls were innocent of provocative art: a spider's web has covered the shrine and rank weeds choked the abandoned gods. In 2.25 again he argues that if these were the days welcome to old-fashioned girls, (*saecla . . . antiquis grata puellis*) he would still be Cynthia's reigning lover instead of this upstart intruder. But the self-contradictory elegy 32 overthrows this wishful idealization.

¹⁷ Hubbard (1974) 62 sees imitation of Tib.1.4.21–24.

The sequence of thought is complex and circular, so we must follow it in close paraphrase. Cynthia's endless trips out of town show she is unfaithful to him, leaving the city to avoid his supervision; but it is in vain: he is familiar with her tricks. What is worse is the damage to her *fama*: he has just heard unpleasant gossip about her infidelity all over the city (32.16–24). With a sudden *volte face* he encourages her to resist the malicious tongue that has always attacked beautiful women: her hands are clean, and if she has spent a long night or two in sport with another man, such petty charges do not disturb him (25–30).¹⁸

It seems the poet has decided that if he cannot deny her infidelity he must belittle it, but his method is that of the young man in comedy who, when accused of seduction, said “everyone does it” *volgo faciunt*. The obvious mythical precedent is Helen who left her country for a foreign passion but was allowed back unpunished *sine decreto*. In Euripides’ *Troïades* the susceptible Menelaus renounced his right to kill Helen, but the Latin suggests something more legalistic: that she was never put on trial. But then, before 18 BC no Roman wife would have been put on trial for adultery: is this some imagined bronze age procedure? But Helen was not the first. Venus herself was seduced by lust for Mars but kept her respectability in heaven; worse, she slept with the shepherd (Anchises)¹⁹ on Ida, witnessed by Silenus and the nymphs (33–40). (And the poet’s public knows it was Venus who promised Helen to another Trojan shepherd, prince Paris).

Returning to the present (41–44) Propertius sets Cynthia’s situation against a swarm of fornications—the word *stupra*, least poetic and most legal and damning of words for intercourse, occurs here for the first time in the poet’s work.²⁰ Amid such promiscuity, who will ask how she got rich, from what lover, and by what means? If only one girl is violating custom, Rome is exceptionally fortunate in our time. Once again he carries the record of immorality backwards,

¹⁸ Lilja (1965) 161 rightly compares Catullus’ indulgence of Lesbia’s occasional lapses (*rara furta* 68.136): we might see the euphemistic *furtum* as the antithesis of *stuprum*.

¹⁹ The manuscripts have been corrupted by a scribe expecting a reference to the judgment of Paris on Ida, but *Parim* cannot stand as the beloved of Venus: we need an allusion to Anchises, whose intercourse with the disguised Aphrodite is the theme of the Homeric hymn. Goold adopts Barber’s conjecture *illam pastorem* (not in Barber 1960).

²⁰ On *stuprum*, see Fantham (1992) 267–91. It will recur at 3.19.20 and 4.7 57, both times of Clytemnestra’s adultery.

first to Lesbia, who excuses Cynthia by her precedent. Only a stranger would expect to find old Tatius and hard-living Sabines at Rome—or perhaps it would be more cogent to understand *qui quaerit Tatium veterem durosque Sabinos* as “the man who looks back to Tatius (to find a time of chaste behavior) . . . must have just come to our city.”

This is not a matter of particular ages, but something universal, like a law of nature. It would be more impossible than the cosmic *adunata* of drying up the sea and gathering stars to make our girls averse to sinning. Even before Venus and Mars this was the way when Saturn was king:²¹ who could keep his bed chaste, what goddess lives as the sole mate of one god, during Deucalion's flood or thereafter? (49–56)

Up to this point the poet's argument has moved from strength to strength: why then does he weaken it by returning to mere mortals, to Pasiphae “seduced by the whiteness of a savage bull” and Danae enclosed in her bronze tower, unable to refuse Jupiter's embrace? His purpose is to exonerate Cynthia, and his best argument is the irresistible power of love over either sex. Here the case of Danae enables him to transfer responsibility back from the wanton female to the lustful (and omnipotent) male—the conclusion to which Propertius is leading is that so many models both Greek and Latin have forced him to acquit Cynthia of reproach; *semper vive meo libera iudicio*.

The final poem of Book 2, like the opening poems of Book 3, moves attention away from love itself to the poetry of love. As in Book 1 the male friend, here called Lynceus, has attempted to seduce Cynthia, but he does not write the appropriate kind of poetry: women are indifferent to didactic poetry about the cosmos or life after death (34.51–54). Girls read love poetry, like Virgil's bucolic poems and Propertius' elegies; Lynceus should look at how Propertius is king as party guest among the girls. His boast of women readers will return in Book 3 (2.1–2) as will his new boast of immortalizing the woman he honors: *fortunata, meo si qua es celebrata libello: carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae* (2.17–18). But this third book marks a broadening of theme away from Cynthia herself, who is the central theme of only four poems (3.6 and 8, 10, and 16). Three elegies in Book 3 have something new to say about women: 3.12 in its sympathetic and

²¹ Like the reference to vice in the time of Tatius and the Sabines, questioned by Ovid *Amores* 1.8.39–40, and parodied in Juvenal's introduction to *Satire* 6, Propertius' assumption of greed and venality back in the prehistoric age of Saturn is echoed by Janus in Ovid *Fasti* 1.195–96.

serious depiction of a loyal Roman woman (Aelia Galla bears the name of an elite matron—and is called *coniunx*) whose man has departed on military service, and the longer 3.11 and 3.19, ostensibly about the vices of all womankind. Let us take Galla first because she contributes to a model of loyalty that Propertius will develop fully in the elegiac letter of Arethusa (4.3) and Cornelia's posthumous apologia (4.11). The poet reproaches Postumus for leaving Galla to go on campaign, as if it were not his military duty; instead he reads Postumus' motives as love of glory and sheer greed (cf. *avari* 5) and lingers over Galla's fears for his death. But she is a chaste Penelope, who cannot be overcome by gifts; like Ulysses he can live through every hazards confident that his wife's loyalty (*fi des*) will surpass even Penelope. Just as we feel surprise that the soldier is reproached with a patriotic expedition, we are surprised that it needs to be said that this lady will refuse corrupting gifts. And in fact, the opening situation of 3.20 seems a variant of 3.12, addressed to an unknown woman and denouncing the faithlessness of her lover who has preferred profit to his girl: Africa (like Parthia in 3.12.3) is not worth the lady's distress. In 3.20 the poet sets about striking his own *foedus* of love with the girl, suggesting the difference of tone that might be expected in the same circumstances between a situation of marriage and of romance.

Although 3.11 and 3.19 seem designed and placed, like 3.12 and 20, to serve as a pair, they are vastly different in scale. Cynthia is not named but is a starting point for each elegy. The addressee of 3.11 should not wonder that a woman dominates the poet's life; Cynthia as unnamed addressee of 3.19 is scolded for constantly reproaching our (that is male) lust. But while 3.19 lasts for only twenty-eight lines, of which the first ten are argument, and the larger second part cites the bad women of mythology as witnesses, 3.11 begins with the evil dominant women and carries the list to twenty-eight before reaching the poet's real theme, the ultimate bad woman, Cleopatra. The libidinous women of 19 are not promiscuous free agents, but overcome by a single passion, and unable to impose limits on their crazy hearts (*captae mentis*): they are forces of nature like fire and water and can no more be quenched than rivers can be turned back to their sources (echoes of Medea!) or the treacherous Syrtes and Cape Malea offer safe harbor. All are violators of the family: Pasiphae who put on her wooden disguise to win the fastidious bull; Tyro,

who fell in love with the river Enipeus,²² Medea, who as mother vented her anger on her sons; Clytemnestra, whose fornication disgraced the house of Pelops; and Scylla, who killed her father from lust for Minos. Minos' good judgment in condemning Scylla has earned him the position of chief justice in the underworld. Inevitably, despite the neat ending, the poem is anticlimactic, doing less than justice to the Roman myth of female *impotentia*.

3.11 reiterates the poets' subjection, enslaved (*addictum*), cowardly, and unable to break the yoke, exposed since youth to wounds and perils like a sailor or soldier.²³ Yet Medea could force fire-breathing bulls beneath her yoke, sow battling warriors, and close the dragon's jaws; queen Penthesilea dared attack the Greek fleet, and by her beauty conquered her conqueror. From now on the poet's examples are all barbarian queens, whose power is symbolized by the men or powers they subdue: Omphale, who enslaved Hercules,²⁴ and Semiramis who built the walls of Babylon, tamed Euphrates, and ordered Bactra to bow its head beneath her command. The distich 27–28 turning from dominant women to dominated males seems inadequately motivated, and to understand Propertius' argument the reader must know that Semiramis constructed a temple of Belus/Jupiter to which the god came to sleep as her consort; hence "Jupiter disgraces himself and his temple."²⁵ Without this knowledge the transition to Cleopatra is unclear. But with it we see that Propertius is more interested in the shameful male lover than the issue of women's lust. This barbarian queen contrived shame for our warfare, demanding the walls of Rome as price of her vile marriage and the bondage of our senate to her powers (*addictos in sua iura patres*). The scandal of Cleopatra was held against Antony by every Augustan poet, though the Roman

²² Propertius evokes Tyro three times: 1.13.21, 2.28.51 simply recall from *Odyssey* 11.235–59 the union of Salmoneus' lovely daughter with Poseidon, disguised as the river Enipeus: she gave birth to the twins Neleus and Pelias, and then three sons by her mortal marriage. Apart from her passion for the river Tyro seems a very harmless example of evil desire.

²³ Like 1.6, this is a refinement of the so-called *Servitium amoris*, enslavement to love; see Lyne (1979), with a subsidiary allusion to the poet's other paradigm of suffering, the soldier's sufferings (*militia amoris*).

²⁴ On Antony represented as Hercules enslaved to Omphale, see Griffin (1985) 46 and n. 79, and Zanker (1987) 58–62 and fig. 45.a, b.

²⁵ On 3.11.27–28, see Hubbard (1968) 317, citing Herodotus 1.181–82 and Diodorus 2.9.4.

general usually went unnamed. Much of the abuse heaped upon her in 33–58 is familiar from *Aeneid* 8. 685–88, 696–713, *Epode* 9, and *Odes* 1.37. Propertius had compared his own shame at rejection in love to Antony's humiliation in 2.16.37–42: "you should be ashamed!" yes, ashamed, except that as they say, "love shamed is wont to have deaf ears." It was *infamis amor* that compelled the leader who filled the sea with futile din, to turn tail with his fleet. In 3.11 it is Cleopatra's turn. Williams (1968) 558 is uncomfortable with Propertius' attempt to fuse private and political material, whereas Griffin (1977/1985) sees the poet as deliberately assimilating himself to Antony, the glorious romantic failure.

From the point of view of Propertius' evolving composition, I find it more significant that he not only links Cleopatra's would-be tyranny to his own fate (11.32 = 11.2) but evokes the same language in 3.13, a denunciation of domestic luxury and the corrupt greed of married women at Rome: compare Cleopatra's schemes of disgrace (*opprobria*) in 3.11.29 with "the spoils of [the matron's] disgrace thrust in our faces" in 3.13, and the queen's demand of Roman walls as the price of her vile marriage (*coniugis obsceni pretium Roman poposcit/moenia*) with the matron's lack of respect in demanding and giving, and her removal of any hesitation for a price (3.13 11–14). It is the East that has sent Rome the luxuries that corrupt chaste and enclosed wives (3.13.5–10), and the Alexandrian *meretrix* (3.11.39) who has dared to attack Rome. It seems to me that private and public are converging in these poems. 3.11 exploits the theme of tyranny and national liberty to suggest that escape from Tarquinius Superbus would have been futile, if we Romans had had to endure a woman's rule: *si mulier patienda fuit* (3.11.49).

The poet has created his own portrait as subjected by passion to the fickleness, greed, lust, and perjury of an untrustworthy and tyrannical woman. There are many elegies that offer a happier and more favorable image of his beloved, but it seems that the genre needed this extreme image to obtain its pathos. If so, whose is the *capta mens* (3.19.4), and whose is the *impotentia* so often stigmatized by Roman moralists as *muliebris*?²⁶

²⁶ On womanly lack of self-control, *muliebris impotentia*, see Cato's defense of the Lex Oppia, Livy 34.2.2, Tac. *Ann* 4.57.4, *matris impotentia* (on Livia and Tiberius): the noun cannot occur in dactylic hexameter or elegy. Cf. also *impotens* of Cleopatra's unrestrained ambition, Hor. *Odes* 1.37.10, but also of passionate lovers, Cat. 35.12, Tac. *Hist* 4.44. In the senate debate on the impact of governors' wives in the provinces at Tac. *Ann*. 3.33–34 both sides agreeing on women's lust for power (*impotentibus mulierum iussis*) and lack of restraint.

CHAPTER NINE

PROPERTIUS AND RHETORIC*

Tobias Reinhardt

*Cynthia facundi carmen iuvenale Properti
accepit famam, non minus ipsa dedit.*
Martial 14.189

When we talk about rhetorical features of any classical author, we may want to be guided (yet not constrained) by the ancient conception of the term ‘rhetoric’.¹ Thus conceived, rhetoric would comprise the methodical analysis and generation of persuasive discourse as it was performed in certain contexts, and the analysis, description and evaluation of any type of formal writing, primarily though not exclusively from the viewpoint of style.² The latter raises the obvious problem that one can put a label derived from an ancient rhetorical manual to almost every type of argument and figure of style, without much illumination. So a rhetorical feature in this weak sense should be marked, e.g., through use, function or distribution, to class as a rhetorical feature in the stronger sense. But ancient stylistics, while it may be too wide a frame of reference if left unqualified, may also be too narrow: a construction like *non quo* + subj. . . . *sed quia* + indic., which we might term ‘rhetorical’ both because of its distribution (it is frequent in Cicero’s speeches, but absent from poetry except for Lucretius and Ovid) and its function (it considers one reason, which may or may not have been mentioned before, and rejects it in favor of another one),³ would lie outside the scope of ancient stylistics to describe. However, our criteria should allow us to

* I am indebted to Gunther Martin for critical comments on an earlier draft of this article.

¹ Cf. Fränkel (1945) 167–69 for an attempt to arrive at a meaningful concept of ‘rhetorical feature’ for Ovid.

² Heath (1993) shows that the ancient scholia on Homer use rhetorical theory concerned with forensic argument as a conceptual framework.

³ See Kenney (1999) 407 and nn. 37–38.

accommodate such features. In what follows I will provide a survey of what might, against the background just provided, be called rhetorical aspects of Propertius' work. Given the scope of this study, it will not be possible to be exhaustive or to give a clear sense of how frequent and distinctive individual features are. Rather, I want to suggest ways of looking at Propertius through the eyes of a student of rhetoric, highlighting in the process how the issue of rhetoric is bound up with aspects of Propertius that have received more attention.

I set out a few background considerations first, then explain my criteria, and finally proceed to the discussion of the evidence. This arrangement is partly due to the fact that my criteria do not represent mutually exclusive categories—i.e., they may serve to group rather than classify evidence, and an individual passage may include a range of rhetorical features that fall under several of my criteria. In that case my arrangement will depend on what feature I consider primary.

Propertius does not seem as obviously a rhetorical poet as his fellow elegist Ovid. This may be due to a comparative lack of rhetorical features in whatever sense in his poetry, but it may also be due to the absence of relevant external, 'biographical' information about his rhetorical education, of the kind that the elder Seneca provides on Ovid⁴ and that would make modern scholars study him from that point of view.⁵ We do not know exactly what rhetorical training in Propertius' youth looked like. I shall not devote more space to the kind of rhetorical education Propertius may have enjoyed, and just refer to the *communis opinio* that, even if ancient sources suggest that declamation became prominent only in the second half of the first century BC, in fact very similar exercises were customary already when Cicero was a young man. I should assume, therefore, that *Stilville*, not rhetorical education of a certain format, accounts for Propertius not writing in the clipped Ovidian way. As for comparative material from which inspiration may be drawn, it is of course profitable to consult studies of rhetorical aspects of other Roman poets,⁶ but it is also profitable to look at Greek literature of the second half of the fifth century BC. For it is conventionally and

⁴ Discussed by Higham (1958).

⁵ Keith (1999) 52–53 tries to construct such biographical information from circumstantial evidence.

⁶ Notable works include de Decker (1913), Canter (1925), Clarke (1949), Feeney (1990), Selden (1992), Tarrant (1995), Toohey (1997), Jones (1997).

plausibly held that rhetoric (in a stronger sense yet to be clarified) came into being in that period, and it is the subject of a substantial body of secondary literature in what way this development manifests itself in the literature of the time.⁷ In a way, some problems these studies face are similar to ours, given that speeches aiming at persuasion are in evidence in Greek literature well before the emergence of rhetoric as a technical discipline: e.g., how can we distinguish if the persuasive arguments a tragic poet puts into the mouth of a character in one of his plays are the product of an intuitive grasp of such arguments or are informed by reflection on processes of persuasion? When does life begin to influence art by modifying the situations in which debates in tragedy are conducted?

The Criteria

1. The most obvious and elementary criterion is ‘persuasion’, either in such a way that (i) a speaker in the narrative attempts to persuade another individual or group of individuals situated in the text to pursue a particular course of action or to adopt a certain view, so that it is the broad thrust of the narrative as well as individual features that may be associated with persuasion; or in such a way that (ii) reference is made to such an attempt at persuasion,⁸ so that persuasion becomes a theme of the narrative; or in such a way that (iii) the narrative is persuasive in the sense that it is apt to create belief in us as readers, either by giving a factual feel to the narrative or by giving an impression of real-life speech, speech as performed by ‘real people’. (However, characters in the narrative may show themselves susceptible to these features too.)

The rhetorical tradition itself identified ‘persuasion’, and ‘persuasion through words’ in particular as opposed to, e.g., physical beauty as the formal goal of the art of rhetoric,⁹ so items (i) and (ii) above should be uncontroversial. The inclusion of item (iii) may be justified

⁷ See Schmalzriedt (1980), Scodel (1999–2000), Riedweg (2000), and Xanthakis-Karamanos (1979).

⁸ Metatextual statements that present elegy as a poetry of courtship are on my division a different but related issue, which will be dealt with below.

⁹ Quint. 2.15 is a historical survey of views held on the matter. Q. himself holds a minority view: he posits *bene dicere* as the goal of rhetoric, so he dismisses not just

by the following considerations. First, disallowing realism devices would seem to be an artificial restriction. On the level of the individual linguistic or stylistic feature, a narrative may serve a persuasive purpose in virtue of being realistic, and may as such be informed by rhetorical rules. A sub-set of these rules (those for the *narratio*) is specifically concerned with generating narratives that affect to be accurate depictions of reality and are in fact anything but; Quint. 4.2.57 quotes a sentence from the *narratio* of the *Miloniana* and comments that *verbis vulgaribus et cotidianis* ('through common, everyday language') it generates plausibility conducive to the argumentative goal of the speech (it is described how Milo changed his clothes and 'waited for his wife to get ready, as one does' ahead of the battle of Bovilla,¹⁰ the implication being that he did not anticipate to clash with Clodius).¹¹ Second, it is characteristic for Propertius' elegies that they play with their readership's temptation to identify speaker/narrator and author on the one hand (as one would in the case of factual accounts or narratives affecting to be factual accounts like historiographical texts), and the 'world' referred to in the elegies and reality on the other; this sort of play may in itself be called rhetorical (see my next criterion).¹²

2. Rhetorical discourse is often selfconscious in a particular way, i.e., it reveals a sense of its own contrivance *qua* persuasive discourse. It is widely agreed that the emergence of a metalanguage to refer to features of rhetorical discourse in c. 5–4 BC is the moment when rhetoric ceased to be taught and learned intuitively. It is this metalanguage that is instrumental to rhetoric's ability to describe and methodically generate persuasive speech irrespective of content, and to account for its own successes and failures and hence become an art in the ancient sense of the term. The occurrence of elements of this metalanguage, i.e., of rhetorical terminology, in rhetorical discourse

'persuasion' on the grounds that, e.g., beauty can persuade too (2.15.6–9), but also 'persuasion through words' with reference to *meretrices adulatores corruptores* 'courtesans, flatterers, corrupters' (2.15.11).

¹⁰ The inclusion of seemingly irrelevant detail, like the reference to Milo's wife, is a typical case of a realism device standardly used in persuasive contexts.

¹¹ See Dingel (1988) 57 on argumentative narrative style in *narrationes* in the *Decl. min.*

¹² A similar kind of play can be observed in Roman oratory; see Klodt (2003) on Cicero's practice to invite his audience to view the individuals involved in a case as characters in a drama.

itself is then a rhetorical feature. Rhetoricians like Seneca the Elder would advise the orator to conceal his art (*Contr.* 7, *praef.* 3), but it can be demonstrated that for a suitably conditioned audience it can enhance the persuasiveness of oratory if art is not thus concealed. For instance, Lysias at 3.37 presents his audience with a particular line of argument, and then comments on it by hinting that its very implausibility makes the argument plausible (the underlying assumption being that the standards of plausibility are higher in fiction than they are in truth).¹³ In general, comments that reveal an awareness on the part of the speaker that he is being evaluated may come under this heading. An orator is treading a fine line with such meta-textual remarks, since there is an obvious danger of appearing disingenuous. It fits very well with this that an orator may try to disrupt the fiction of an opponent's argument by pointing out that it is a product of contrivance. This may be done bluntly, by dismissing the opponent's speech as 'mere rhetoric' or 'empty words',¹⁴ or it may be done more subtly through a turn of phrase or a particular way of recapitulating an opponent's argument.¹⁵ Similarly, a speaker may be self-conscious by referring to structural features of his own speech.¹⁶ I would also include features here that reveal in a conspicuous way reflection on either audience response or the communicative situation in general.¹⁷

3. Rhetorical performance is associated with particular locations or settings (the courtroom, the assembly, any suitable context for the *genus laudativum*). Reference to such contexts should qualify as a 'rhetorical feature', cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 11.380 *non est implenda curia verbis* ('one must not fill the council hall with talk now', with Horsfall

¹³ See Schmitz (2000) 59 on the passage. The relevant technical term is τὸ εἰκὸς 'the plausible' (but the term can have other meanings too that cannot be clearly separated).

¹⁴ Cf. Macleod (1983) index s.v. rhetoric, 'fine/empty words'.

¹⁵ See Stroh (2003) 8 on *declamare* in Cic. *S.Rosc.* 82, cf. Sall. *Cat.* 51.9 *enumeravere* (Caesar speaking; he goes on to rehearse in a mechanical way what earlier speakers are likely to have said with great pathos), and Tac. *Dial.* 14.2, where *accuratissimus sermo* comments (more urbanely than the previous two instances) on the well-preparedness of Aper's supposedly *ex tempore* speech.

¹⁶ See Russell/Wilson (1981) xiv on the beginning of Agathon's speech in Plato, *Symp.* 194e; cf., e.g., Eur. *Hec.* 824 and 835, as well as extant Roman declamations *passim* (e.g., 'Quint.', *Decl. mai.* 3.7 *init.* or 3.19, where the speaker, at the end of the *peroratio*, reflects on what the rules of the *peroratio* would require him to do).

¹⁷ See Hornblower (1994) 157 on such features in Thucydides; Scodel (1999–2000) 138.

ad loc.; on *verbis* see previous paragraph), although if a speaker shows awareness of being in a competitive context we may get close to the previous category. Reference to the *actio* of the speaker, itself the object of extensive reflection in rhetorical manuals, may be included here (cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.132–3).¹⁸ And some ‘legal’ features may be included here, like the figurative reference to particular procedures (cf. Kenney 1969); in Rome orators of course appeared in private trials on a regular basis (it is due to the accidents of survival that extant Roman oratory seems to suggest otherwise).

4. Next, there is such a thing as rhetorical motifs that recur in rhetorical discourse, either in real life—i.e., in the courtroom, on the political stage, or in the classroom—or in literature.¹⁹

5. Further, any stylistic feature that is in a vague sense ‘rhetorical’ to begin with and which appears as particularly rhetorical through distribution or use.

6. Finally, there are popular rhetorical features that are to be dissociated from rhetorical training and school rhetoric but which nonetheless are connected with a situation in which an individual addresses an audience in a speech in order to induce a certain course of action—e.g., the repetition patterns that are associated with a *flagitatio* and are reflected in Catullus *c.* 42.²⁰

The Evidence

1. It has been observed by Tränkle (1960) 143–49 that the situations in which Propertius’ elegies are spoken are often in some sense open and undecided, thus creating the scope for an attempt to influence a person addressed. By contrast, the speaker in Tibullus’ elegies usually indulges in introspection or solitary meditation rather than dialogue.²¹ Propertius 1.2 is the first sustained attempt at persuasion: the speaker addresses Cynthia and tries to prevent her from using cosmetic help to enhance her beauty, ostensibly because that

¹⁸ See Hall (2004), with full bibliography.

¹⁹ E.g., political stage: *libertas* in Verg. *Ecl.* 1.27, see Clausen (1994) 31; classroom: ‘advice to Agamemnon on the question whether he should sacrifice Iphigeneia’ (see Tarrant 1995, 73; literature: oratory as a storm, first in Hom. *Il.* 3.222).

²⁰ See Fraenkel (1961), esp. 48–50, and earlier Usener (1901) 20–21.

²¹ Ovid is of course more similar to Propertius (see Tarrant 1995).

would make her needlessly attractive for other men. Two inconspicuous phrases deserve comment: *crede mihi* in line 7 is of course on one level of description colloquial and conveys emphasis,²² but at the same time marks an attempt at persuasion like Kreon's invitation to Oedipus to 'be persuaded by him' (Soph. *O.T.* 756, Oedipus pointedly refuses to do so in 797);²³ cf. also the use of *crede mihi* in an especially implausible context in 2.26b.53. *Aspice* in line 9 has a similar colloquial flair (although its distribution is less clear cut), but at the same time is rhetorical in that it invokes the unsurpassable evidential force of seeing something with one's own eyes (cf. the famous courtroom example in Plat. *Theaet.* 200d–201c). Looking back at 1.1, it is clear that that poem, while not itself an attempt at persuasion, sets the scene for 1.2 in that the speaker's need for a means to influence Cynthia is established, as well as his sense of powerlessness verbalized; especially the last theme is of course reminiscent of commonplaces used in the proems of speeches. In 1.3 then, Cynthia gets her first speaking part: the speaker returns late from a banquet and finds her asleep, but then she wakes up and delivers an accusation against the speaker. She is presented as speaking in a self-conscious way: after an initial accusation in the form of a rhetorical question, a second question that glosses the first one by explaining why she asked it (lines 35–38). When she then proceeds to wish that Propertius may spend as many lonely nights *me miseram qualis semper habere iubet* 'such as you are always compelling poor me to endure' (40), one wonders about the force of *semper*: is it a realism device, imitating the hyperbolic manner of an upset speaker ('you *always* do x'), or is it a self-conscious comment on the limited set of motifs that are to be found in Roman elegy?²⁴ (If the latter, is it assisted by *iubet* in the sense of 'you command', hence hinting at the fact that Cynthia herself is a creation of Propertius (see below), or is *iubet* merely equivalent to *cogis* (*tua improbitate*), as Enk *ad loc.* would have it?) Poems 1.8a and 8b form a pair, whereby 8a is an attempt to

²² Tränkle (1960) 9–10; on *crede mihi/mihi crede*, see also Landgraf (1914) 187.

²³ On the passage, see Schmalzriedt (1980) 99.

²⁴ Cf. 3.25.9–10, where the speaker bids farewell to the *limina* he used to stain with his tears, as well as the door he did not manage to smash; these are references to physical objects on one level, but to recurrent elements of a certain type of poetry on the other (the poem as a whole is on one level a farewell to love elegy). That in 1.2 we are still at the beginning of the collection of elegies is compatible with this interpretation; cf. Zetzel (1996) 75 on *dicebam* in Ov. *Am.* 1.14.1.

talk Cynthia out of a journey to Illyria and 8b then reports success. The inferential *igitur* in 1.8a.1 presents the poem as spoken in an ongoing exchange; the speaker infers from Cynthia's decision to travel to Illyria that she must either be insane or not care about him at all. Such inferences from someone's actions to the same person's motivation are among the most basic features of rhetorical doctrine, connected with the rules relating to the *status* 'coniectura' (cf., e.g., Cic. *Inv.* 2.18ff.; Quint. *Inst. Or.* 2.4.26). To be in this way inferential is in itself not yet rhetorical, but this poem is an attempt at persuasion and from the start shows numerous stylistic features, like the accumulation of outraged questions, which create a suitably rhetorical context. Compare 3.8 for a related case of inferences from physical appearance to state of mind; there the speaker calls himself *haruspex* (17), but that is a metaphorical use, highlighting the kind of activity he is engaged in—*haruspices* are concerned with other things (see also 18).²⁵ Moreover, 1.8a is rhetorical in a secondary way, *qua* allusion to a model that is itself rhetorical according to my criteria: it adapts the abandonment monologue typically uttered by female speakers to a male speaker (Ariadne in Cat. 64.132ff.), thus playing on the inversion of gender roles that is partially constitutive of the genre (of course, the rhetorical quality of the speech of Ariadne is itself inherited). That the *carmen* is presented as instrumental in inducing the change of mind (1.8b.40) is of note too (see below). In 1.16, a monologue delivered by the door that separated the lovers, a direct speech by the lover directed at the door is inserted and meant to open the door, and lines 29–32 refer to the physiological effects the speech will have on the girl. 2.28a is formally a prayer, but the petulant tone (line 1 *tandem*) together with the legalistic ring of some of the arguments offered is redolent of forensic oratory: if Jupiter fails to save Cynthia, this will result in an indictment against him (line 2 *tam formosa tuum mortua crimen erit*, cf. line 5 *crimen, culpa*; cf. also line 8 *iurarunt*).²⁶ In 4.9.33–50 Hercules pleads with the priestesses of

²⁵ Cf. the use of the words τεκμήριον 'proof' and τεκμαίρεσθαι 'to judge from evidence' by Euripides and Sophocles; see Schmalzriedt (1980) 96.

²⁶ For the tone cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 585–86 *Fides, novisti me et ego te: cave sis tibi, / ne tu immutassis nomen, si hoc concreduo*, i.e., make sure you don't have to be called *Perfidia*, with Fraenkel (1960) 27, and more generally Kleinknecht (1937), who, however, does not cover Propertius.

the Bona Dea, referring to his achievements as the grounds on which he should be granted admission.

2. One of the well-recognized rhetorical features of Roman elegy and Propertius' poetry in particular is the representation and 'use' of elegy as a poetry of courtship; see Stroh (1971), who distinguishes between direct courtship (elegy referred to as instrumental in persuading the girl) and indirect courtship (elegy presented as ensuring the immortality of the girl). The terminology used to refer to this function can often be paralleled from rhetorical manuals, as can some of the motifs used to characterise elegy. Poem 1.7 is central to this aspect, especially 1–8. As Stroh (1971) 9–21 observes, epic and elegiac poetry are contrasted there not with reference to their aesthetic worth, but in terms of their usefulness for a man who has to find a means to induce goodwill on the part of his beloved. The epic poet needs a fate that is *mollis* in order not to run into trouble with his poetic productions; otherwise he will fall in love and be ill-equipped (see 15–20 of the same poem). The speaker describes his poetic production as *amores agitare*, which is unusual because it does not suggest *literary* activity at all, and makes it clear that in doing this he is looking for a weapon he can deploy against the *dura domina* (6). Shackleton Bailey (1956) 21–2 pointed out that *dolor* rather than *ingenium* cited as a motivating factor is a rhetorical theme (7–8 *nec tantum ingenio quantum servire dolori / cogor* 'I am compelled to serve less my talent than my pain'), in the sense that it can be paralleled from Cicero's speeches or rhetorical works (*Sest.* 3; *Or.* 130). There it would make the point that the orator's speech reveals raw emotion as opposed to calculating ingenuity; here the effect is slightly different: writing elegy is presented not so much as an emotional as a practical necessity—for there to be any chance to soothe the *dolor*, the speaker has to write elegy (thus Stroh 1971, 11).²⁷ Reference to elegy *qua* efficacious discourse are not limited to Book 1. One could add, e.g., 3.23, a lament about the fact that the speaker has lost his writing tablets; these are first referred to as *doctae* in 1, but in 3–4 we are told that they enjoyed *fides* even if unsealed because of their patina, of course a necessary condition for them to make an impact with the addressee; 5 identifies their function as *placare puellas*. In 6

²⁷ In addition, 1.7 can be seen as an example of persuasive discourse, according to my first criterion.

we are told that they knew how to utter *verba diserta* even without the speaker doing anything; 10 then refers to the *effectus bonos* the tablets used to bring about. In 1.19.24 the speaker comments that he wants to ‘bend’ Cynthia through threats, so that she may continue to love him after his death (*flectitur assiduis certa puella minis*).²⁸ It is relevant in this connection that the elegies style themselves as not just directed at an addressee who might not be susceptible but as being in competition with other types of influence, whether it is material favors bestowed by rivals (cf. 2.16) or attempts at persuasion mounted by them (1.11.7–8). The occasional awareness of the speaker that he is being evaluated is connected with this (cf. *num tibi causa levis* ‘does that not appear to be a valid reason to you’ in 2.24a.10; the context is a defense of the speaker’s visits to prostitutes). Moreover, Cynthia partakes in this system of interrelating attempts to exercise influence, in more than one way. She is presented as having magical powers (see next paragraph), and her looks have persuasive force: her dying her hair is described in terms of verbal communication as ‘lying’ (2.18c.28 *mentita*).

A motif that is closely associated with the theme of courtship is that of magic. Zetzel (1996) 91–99 explores the issue, partially drawing on earlier work by Luck (1962), but in doing this interprets many features like references to the efficacy of the poet’s *carmina* within the context of that theme. We should note that rhetoric and magic are interdependent themes here, not competing ones, and that there is a tradition going back to Gorgias’ *Helen* (14) for orators to present themselves as endowed with magical powers.²⁹ As to the first point just made, the sequence of narrative events in Book 1 is crucial: the speaker reveals in poem 1 that he needs a tool to secure the favor of the girl (17–18 *in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artis, / nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire vias* ‘in my case dull-witted Love thinks up no stratagems, and remembers not to tread, as formerly, his well-known paths’ (Goold’s translation)), that magic would in principle fit the bill, but that he does not believe in it, at least in its conventional form (19–24; see Shackleton Bailey 1949, 22–23). In 1.5 then, where Gallus is warned to avoid Cynthia, she is presented as having

²⁸ For *flectere* as a technical term used of exercising influence rhetorically, cf. *TLL* s.v. 892.81ff., but cf. already Enn. *Ann.* 246 *quianam dictis nostris sententia flexa est*, with Skutsch *ad loc.*

²⁹ See in particular de Romilly (1975) 3–22.

supernatural powers (31–32, on which see Zetzel 1996, 93–94, who comments on the emphatic use of *posse*, and the connection of *quaerere*, *rogare*, and *venire*), and the speaker makes it clear that he is helpless (28). Poem 1.7 then aligns elegiac poetry with rhetorical discourse in the way set out above, and a connection with magic is inobtrusive; but in 1.10 the speaker's ability to influence others and cure the pains of love is likened to magical powers (15–18). The sequence in which the themes of rhetoric and magic are introduced suggests seeing them as intertwined and supporting each other. In Rome, where provisions against magic and witchcraft go back to the law of the Twelve Tables, an orator would not normally present himself as a magician in Propertius' day, but could explain failure to perform in court with the opposite's party successful attempt to cast a spell on him (one of Cicero's opponents did that, according to *Brut.* 217 and *Orat.* 128–9; Cicero's client was blamed, not Cicero himself). But Propertius will not be restricted by Roman courtroom practice of his day, and if we look further afield a connection between the *facundia* of an orator and magic is easy to demonstrate.³⁰

An area where rhetorical theory impacts on elegiac discourse is the reference to physical features of the elegiac speaker through terminology current and developed in connection with the 'humble' style, the *genus tenue*;³¹ a stimulating study on this topic is Keith (1999). The background conditions are briefly (i) the fact that doctrines of style from the earliest time were applied to oratory and poetry, and genres of poetry assigned to the three *genera* (e.g. epic belongs to the *genus grande*, elegy to the *genus tenue*); that (ii) there was a tradition of describing stylistic features of speech in terms of the body metaphor;³² that (iii) rhetorical manuals identify both virtues and vices of speaking in the three *genera*; and that (iv) there was a tendency to identify work and author, and his physical features in particular, just as we might say today that Thomas Mann is turgid, thereby making an evaluation of the author's prose style. I begin with one striking instance, not discussed by Keith (1999): in 4.3, the letter of Arethusa to her absent husband which is well known for anticipating Ovid's

³⁰ See the material collected by Abt (1908) 18, 56, 184.

³¹ A useful historical survey of the evidence on the doctrine of the three types of style is Quadlbauer (1958).

³² See Fantham (1972) 163–75; Iodice di Martino (1986); Mayer (2001) 159–60 on Tac. *Dial.* 21.8.

Heroides format with its inversion of the conventions of Roman elegy (female first-person speaker, exhibiting emotions characteristically shown by the male speakers, etc.)—the speaker worries about the physical stress her husband, while on campaign, has to endure, but then states that such stress would be better than him being worn out by another girl (23–28):

*dic mihi, num teneros urit lorica lacertos?
 num gravis imbellis atterit hasta manus?
 haec noceant potius, quam dentibus ulla puella
 det mihi plorandas per tua colla notas!
 diceris et macie vultum tenuasse: sed opto
 e desiderio sit color iste meo.*

‘Tell me, does not the breast plate cause your delicate shoulders to burn, and does not the heavy spear tear your unwarlike hands? May this rather hurt you than that some girl with her teeth leaves marks on your neck for me to lament. It is said too that your face has become thin; but I hope that this pallor comes from missing me.’

This extract is shot through with critical terminology. The husband’s shoulders are *tener* like those of an elegiac speaker, and indeed *tener* like elegiac discourse, the spear, a metaphor for epic subject matter (it is *gravis*, cf. 2.10.9), tears his hands; all this looks back to the *recusatio* poems, and is couched in the well-known Callimachean terminology, which partially overlaps with the set of rhetorical terms that are my present concern (see below on the relationship). But the last two lines move away from Callimacheanism. A small incongruity points to a double meaning of *color*: his face is said to have become thin, and yet she replies that this (pale) complexion was hopefully due to his longing for her. *Color* is not just used of faces but is also used metaphorically for the ‘complexion’ one gives to a speech.³³ In Cic. *de Orat.* 2.60 one of the speakers says that, just as the skin takes on color when being exposed to the sun, so his oratory takes on the color (*quasi colorari*), as it were, of the books he reads; in 3.199 another speaker remarks on the ‘general character and, so to speak, *color*’ of a speech: it is ‘smooth and slim (*teres et tenuis*), but not without muscles and strength’, and it ‘should have a certain charming *color*—not smeared on with rouge (*fucus*), but infused with blood’ (*sanguis*).

³³ See Roller (2001) for the uses of the term in rhetorical contexts.

The last part can help us illuminate our passage further: the term *color* can have an implication of falsehood, of being make-up rather than the real thing, and Arethusa may be seen not to be entirely convinced about the truthfulness of her husband (this skeptical note partly depends on *diceris*—she has to rely on what he says³⁴—and *iste*, which on one level construes *color* as referring back to the content of his statement, the ‘spin’ he has put on his account).³⁵ The relationship between the rhetorical terminology used to characterize the *genus tenue* and Callimachean poetological terminology is that the two overlap where positive characterizations are concerned (see *tenuis* above), but that the terms used to characterize the vices of the *genus tenue* have, for obvious reasons, no Callimachean counterpart. Keith (1998) has demonstrated the parallelism between the terminology used to describe the physique of the elegiac speaker and that used to describe the vices of the *genus tenue*.³⁶ She has further demonstrated that the ‘Callimachean’ and the rhetorical set of critical terms are not coextensive,³⁷ exclusively connecting the latter with the Atticism debate as reflected in Cicero’s *Brut.* and *Or.* While Atticist oratory was indeed associated with the *genus tenue*, and while it is plausible that this debate in particular is relevant to Propertius’s work (the leading representative of Atticist oratory is the neoteric poet Calvus), one should note that the relevant terminology is in evidence in *Rhet. Her.* already (which is likely to predate the Atticism debate by a generation),

³⁴ It does not seem economical to assume that Arethusa is receiving letters from comrades of her husband (*pace* Goold 1999 *ad loc.*). If anything, the reference must be to communications from him. But why the passive then? It is relevant that Arethusa is in jealous and somewhat paranoid mood (see Richardson 1976, 431). This may be reflected in a failure to identify the first-person narrator in a letter from her husband with her husband (people can be observed to speak like that when cornering others about things they have written: ‘you write here sc. in this document . . .’ may become ‘it [the document] says here that . . .’). Note also that the husband is grammatically the agent who brings about his own emaciated appearance; this need not just be a manner of speaking, as Rothstein *ad loc.* would have it.

³⁵ See Russell (2001) vol. ii, p. 264 n. 57; a similar use of *color* is in Sen. *Thy.* 904; see Goldberg 1997, 171–72.

³⁶ See Keith (1999) 52–57. I reproduce, e.g., 1.5.21–22 *nec iam pallorem totiens mirabere nostrum, / aut cur sim toto corpore nullus ego ~ sanguinem deperdebat* (*Brut.* 283, referring to Calvus’ style), and the references to *exilitas*, *tenuitas*, *ienuitas*, *siccitas*, and *inopia* (*Brut.* 285), as well as the *exsiccatum genus orationis* (*Brut.* 291).

³⁷ Reitzenstein (1931) tried to demonstrate that the key Callimachean term λεπτός originates from rhetorical theory, but was criticized by Wimmel (1960) 2 n. 2 for looking at the term in isolation.

and in earlier Greek texts,³⁸ and that Cicero talks in the same terms about Stoic oratory (e.g., *de Orat.* 2.159). The overall effect of all this is of course one that runs counter to the realism tendencies in evidence elsewhere in Propertius. If we assume that the main difference between factual and fictional narrative is the ontological status of the world referred to in each case, then the devices just discussed, when juxtaposed with the realism devices that are also to be found in Propertius, blur this distinction. Moreover, complementary effects can be observed in relation to the girl, although these are not normally considered rhetorical devices: I am thinking, e.g., of poem 2.10, where Cynthia appears less as a real-life woman and more as a literary subject, whose treatment in poetry is a matter of choice for the speaker rather than compulsion (which it was in Book 1); see Quadlbauer (1958) 82, Wyke (1987) and Zetzel (1996).

3. I proceed to traces of a rhetorical situation or setting. Poem 1.9, directed at the epic poet Ponticus who had been told in 1.7 that his poetry will be of no use to him when he falls in love, pictures him in precisely that situation, which is likened to being in front of the judge (3 *venis ad iura puellae*, who is in a position to give orders; cf. Heumann-Seckel s.v. *imperare*; cf. also 2.13a.14 *domina iudice*). A number of features fit the theme of Ponticus being in need of the powers of persuasion: the narrator insists on his competence *qua* effective speaker (7 *peritum*),³⁹ on *dolor* as a motivating force in rhetorical contexts see above (p. 207), in 14 it is pointed out that as a lover/writer one is being evaluated by the girl, *facilis copia* in 15 qualifies as a rhetorical theme (cf. Quint. 12.5.1). In poem 1.13, addressed to Gallus and anticipating his glee over the speaker's betrayal by his girlfriend, lines 13–14

*haec ego non rumore malo, non augure doctus;
vidi ego: me quaeso teste negare potes?*

'I have learnt about this not from evil rumor, nor from bad signs;
I saw it: can you—do me a favor—deny it given that I testify to it?'

are concerned with the evidential basis of the information available to the speaker (on *vidi* cf. my earlier point about *aspice*, p. 205; quite

³⁸ See Quadlbauer (1958) *passim*, but esp. 64–71 on the Greek background, and 77–81 on *Rhet. Her.*

³⁹ See Schmalzriedt (1980) 99) on similar declarations of competence in Sophocles, Aristophanes, and Plato.

generally, the frequency with which *testes* are cited or invoked in the corpus as a whole is striking). A series of poems, including 1.15, 2.9, and 3.20, are concerned with the *perfidia* of the girl, there are numerous legal features in them like references to contractual obligations (e.g. 3.20.15–16);⁴⁰ 2.9 is the most rhetorical of them, the tone is at times reminiscent of prosecution speeches (e.g., 31 *sed vobis facile est verba et componere fraudes* ‘but for you it is easy to devise (false) words and deceits’; cf. also 36–37), although the overall effect is more that of a rhetorical exercise directed at a mythical heroine. Another group of poems is 2.20 (a defense before the girl), 2.29b (which includes a direct speech by Cynthia in which she defends herself against the charge of infidelity), and 2.30b (where speaker and girlfriend defend themselves against accusations by old men). In 2.29b.35–38 Cynthia presents evidence that suggests she has not been with another man (she cites the state of her bed and the smell of her body; note again 37 *aspice*—when she is talking about *smell*). The *senes* in 2.30b deliver accusations about the dinner parties the speaker and Cynthia attend (13 *accusent*); in support of their case, they cite laws (15 *leges*). In 3.6 the speaker questions a slave in Cynthia’s services, whose compliance, it is suggested, could lead to the release to freedom;⁴¹ this is a rhetorical situation in that it is reminiscent of the interrogation of witnesses in court.⁴² Lines 5–6 reflect on the evidential value of witness statements by slaves,⁴³ in 8–18 the interrogator moves from recapitulation of what the slave did see to inviting speculations about what he might have seen, a strategy that is typical for advocates who want to extract information that suits their argumentative needs from witnesses.⁴⁴ Finally, in 3.19 the speaker addresses the charge

⁴⁰ In 2.34.15–6 there is an allusion to a *vindicatio*. See Kenney (1969) 256 n. 45 on the passage; and his table (253) on the frequency of legal terms in Roman poets, in which Propertius comes second after Ovid, surprisingly so, given the comparatively small bulk of his oeuvre.

⁴¹ See Kenney (1969) 255 on traces of the *vindicatio in libertatem* in Ovid.

⁴² On the role of witness statements of slaves in Roman trials, see Schumacher (1982).

⁴³ Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 2.10, Quint. *Inst. Or.* 5.4.2, Leonhard (1982) 68.

⁴⁴ Another line in 3.6 that merits closer examination is 39 *me quoque consimili impositum torquerier igni* ‘that I am tortured on a similar fire’. ‘Similar to what?’, one is tempted to ask; scholars have taken the reference to be to the fire on which Cynthia is burning (metaphorically), but could it be that the reference is to the slave who is being interrogated? This interpretation would fit with the fact that the speaker is volunteering a ‘statement’ of his own in the next line, backed up by an oath; see Kaser (1934) 1051–52 on oaths in witness statements by Roman citizens.

that all men are driven by *libido*; he replies by saying that this is in fact true of all women. The first word, *obicitur*, is interesting: *obicitur* is often used to refer to a charge of the opposite party in Cicero's speeches, but its frequency in Seneca the Elder and 'Quint.' is striking, where it can be used to introduce the theme of a declamation at its beginning (e.g., *Decl. min.* 328.2). The subject of the poem—*libido* of men and women contrasted—fits well with this air of rhetorical exercise.⁴⁵

4. I move on to rhetorical motifs. In 1.18 the speaker seeks refuge in an isolated spot since he has been repulsed by Cynthia. He agonizes about his situation, and addresses the physical surroundings he is in (19–20). It is perhaps not too fanciful to see a connection with the speech of Philoctetes in Soph. *Phil.* 927–62, delivered after he has been tricked out of his bow, which verbalizes a similar sense of abandonment and includes similar references to the physical setting (936–40).⁴⁶ While the Sophoclean speech itself may be termed rhetorical in some vague sense, it is conceivable that the myth had become stock material for rhetorical exercises,⁴⁷ and the poem can be seen as an instance of an *ethopoeia*. The praise of a city in 3.14 (Sparta) may class as a rhetorical motif, regardless of the fact that its execution is somewhat unusual.⁴⁸ Another poem that may be seen to contain a rhetorical motif is 4.5, the address to the deceased *lena*, where the graphic description of her being shaken by a cough that makes her spit blood through her rotten teeth, complete with realistic detail on her lodgings (lines 65–70), cannot just be paralleled in type with extant invectives, which indulge in synesthetic descriptions of the sheer physical unpleasantness of the human body (the vomiting scene in Cic. *Phil.* 2.63 comes to mind), but with the theory of invective as well.⁴⁹ Rhetorical motifs on a smaller scale include

⁴⁵ On related themes in later Greek declamation, see Hawley (1995) 261–67.

⁴⁶ Given the similarities, the two speeches end in an interestingly dissimilar way: while Philoctetes is implacable, Propertius vows to celebrate Cynthia in song *qualiscumque es* (line 31), before making one last reference to the physical setting (line 32 *saxa*, cf. Soph. *Phil.* 952).

⁴⁷ In *de Orat.* 3.141 Cicero refers to Euripides fr. 796 Nauck² (= fr. 13 Müller), two lines spoken by Odysseus in the exchange with the Trojan embassy in that author's *Philoctetes*, but assigns them to Philoctetes, which may be due to carelessness, but is more plausibly explained by Müller (1997) 258 as due to the fact that Cicero was relying on tralatitious material found in a rhetorical handbook.

⁴⁸ For relevant precepts see Menander Rhetor, pp. 32–42 Russell/Wilson.

⁴⁹ See Schindel (1980) 88–89; Koster (1960), index s.v. 'Körperlichkeit'; Opelt (1982) 132–33.

'the power of words' (1.6.5); contrast 'empty words' in 2.33b.23; and cf. 'deceitful words' in 4.7.21.

5. In order to identify stylistic features that are relatively more frequent in Propertius and rhetorical prose than in other authors/types of text, one should begin by examining those that are predicated on the dialogical and interactive nature of the elegies (see above, p. 204). These would include emotive expressions like interjections and short phrases or clauses of similar force that seek emotional connection with an addressee; see the list of such features in Tränkle (1960) 149ff., a sub-set of which show the distribution envisaged. As to discursive as opposed to emotive features, the frequency of *sententiae* is striking, i.e., brief general aphoristic statements,⁵⁰ which, crucially, are not just reflections largely detached from their context, but have argumentative function, e.g., by being inferential (2.32.1–2 *qui videt, is peccat: qui te non viderit ergo, / non cupiet: facti lumina crimen habent* 'who sees you, commits a sin; so he who has not seen you will not long for you; the eyes bear the guilt for the action', where the last clause is not just inferential but also a parody of legalistic argument),⁵¹ or by encapsulating commonly held opinions that are invoked in arguments grounded by them.⁵² More material could be added if one simply examined Propertius' elegies for stylistic features typically associated with declamation.⁵³

6. As for traces of and references to popular rhetoric as opposed to rhetoric as underpinned by theory and taught in schools, a reference to a *quiritatio* has been identified in 4.8.58 by Maas (1973) 58–59, and the celebrated speech by Cornelia from the underworld (4.11) is influenced by the traditional *laudatio funebris*.⁵⁴ In 4.11 elements of a *consolatio*, a forensic defense speech and a *laudatio funebris* are coupled: as Reitzenstein (1969) 128 observes, for consolatory purposes it is effective to have Cornelia as a speaker, but praise of her

⁵⁰ Ancient discussions include Ar. *Rhet.* 2.21, *Rhet. Her.* 4.24–25, Quint. *Inst. Or.* 8.5.

⁵¹ Cf. other elegiac speakers who blame their hands for hitting the girl (e.g., Tib. 1.6.74, with Maltby *ad loc.*). A related consideration gives rise to a frivolous joke in Cic. *Cael.* 34 (on Appius Claudius Caecus, who is about to address Clodia): *existat . . . Caecus ille; minimum enim dolorem capiet qui istam non videbit.*

⁵² On the rhetorical psychology (or narrative rationale) underpinning the use of *sententiae*, see Sinclair (1993), Schmitz (2000) 62; on *sententiae* in Propertius, see Walter Bennett (1967).

⁵³ See, e.g., Canter (1925) *passim*, Bonner (1949) 149–67, Webb (1997) 349–55.

⁵⁴ On 4.11 see Reitzenstein (1969) and (1970), on the *laudatio funebris* Kierdorf (1980).

own *mores*, as it would figure in a *laudatio funebris*, would easily be seen as tactless; hence Cornelia is introduced defending herself before the judges of the underworld, which allows her to defend herself by citing facts that might have been mentioned in a funeral speech. An influence not considered by Reitzenstein and which may have facilitated the introduction of Cornelia as a speaker is the funeral mime, which did involve an actor impersonating the deceased and imitating his *facta* and *dicta* (e.g., Suet. *Vesp.* 19).⁵⁵ There are numerous rhetorical features on the level of detail, e.g. in 18, 27–28 and 47–49,⁵⁶ as well as 99: *causa perorata est*.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ On funeral mimes, see Purcell (1999) and Sumi (2002).

⁵⁶ See Reitzenstein (1970) *ad locc.*

⁵⁷ In 4.7 *Rhet. Her.* refers to the practice of orators—which was to become ubiquitous later on—of pillaging older Roman drama for *sententiae*. If Propertius provides an extensive allusion to older Roman poetry in a rhetorical context, this may qualify as a rhetorical feature because of the similarity of technique. See Jocelyn (1986) 136 on the resemblance between 4.11.101–2 and the elegiac couplet Ennius put into the mouth of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (Cicero *apud* Sen. *Epp.* 108.34; Lactantius, *Inst.* 1.18.10).

PART FIVE

AN INTERPRETATION OF PROPERTIUS' WORK

CHAPTER TEN

THE FIRST BOOK

Gesine Manuwald

Introduction

Propertius' first book of elegies, also called 'Cynthia', 'Monobiblos' or 'Cynthia Monobiblos', centers around the persona's beloved Cynthia. It therefore is the earliest surviving collection of Roman personal love elegy and even the earliest extant example in Western literature of a whole book of poetry (almost completely) devoted to one girl.¹

In spite of the poetry's 'subjectivity' both lover and beloved as described in the poems are (at least to some extent) fictitious constructs. Accordingly, one has to distinguish between the poet Propertius and the lover/persona/speaker acting in the poems,² even if the persona calls himself 'Propertius' several times (though not in Book 1, but throughout Books 2–4), quite often in amatory contexts and more rarely in poetic ones.³ That contributes to the poetic fiction and endows the persona with a unity of character; it does not mean that identity between the narrated experiences of the lover and Propertius' personality as a poet can be assumed. For the sake of convenience, however, the name 'Propertius' will be employed without reservation in what follows.

This chapter will present the most important features of and issues relevant to the first book by means of a thematically structured overview, in order to give an idea of what the first book is like. Further information on various aspects can be found in the standard

¹ Cf., e.g., van Berchem (1948) 137; King (1975) 108; McNamee (1993) 222.

² Harrison (1994) 18 uses the convenient terms '*auctor*' (writer of the literary work) and '*actor*' (character in the story narrated) to illustrate that distinction.

³ Cf. 2.8.17; 2.14.27; 2.24.35; 2.34.93; 3.3.17; 3.10.15; 4.1.71; 4.7.49.

and/or more recent commentaries on Propertius' elegies;⁴ some literature on individual topics will be referred to below.⁵

Note on the text

The transmitted text of Propertius' elegies is well known to be badly preserved and to present lots of difficulties regarding the reading of individual words and lines, the position of lines and couplets, and the division of poems and even books.⁶ For the first book, fortunately, the general outline is fairly clear (in comparison with other books) as there are few major problems going beyond the corruption of individual words or lines.⁷ Full information can be found in the most recent editions by P. Fedeli (Teubner, 1984, ed. corr. 1994), by G. P. Goold (Loeb, 1990, ed. corr. 1999) and by S. Viarre (Budé, 2005).⁸ Thus the establishment of the text of the first book need not be discussed as a separate issue here.⁹

Title/way of publication/addressee

Propertius opens the first book with the word 'Cynthia' (1.1.1), and in the second book (as transmitted) he talks of 'Cynthia' as if referring

⁴ Cf. Rothstein (1920); Butler/Barber (1933); Enk (1946); Camps (1961); Hodge/Buttimore (1977); Richardson (1977); Fedeli (1980); Baker (1990/2000); Booth (forthcoming, see Booth 2001a, 63 and n. 1).

⁵ Cf. also the standard bibliographies on Propertius (Harrauer 1973; Nethercut 1983; Fedeli/Pinotti 1985; Viparelli 1987) and the bibliography at the end of this volume.

⁶ See J. Butrica and R. Tarrant, this volume.

⁷ Cf., e.g., Camps (1961) v; Günther (1997a) 133. The challenging theory of Georg (2001)—who, because of 'illogical' trains of thought and contradictions or rare uses of language and meter, regards about 40% of the text as later interpolations (attributed to a 'second poet') and therefore deletes that portion—has won no general acceptance so far (see the critical reviews: Rambaux 2001a; Stahl 2002; Günther 2003; Papaioannov 2005).

⁸ A new OCT is being prepared by S. J. Heyworth (forthcoming, approx. 2005/06).—I am indebted to Dr. Stephen Heyworth, who very kindly let me have his draft version of the first book (including text, apparatus, translation, and notes) as well as a copy of his forthcoming article entitled "Propertius, patronage and politics"; from both these works this contribution has gained enormously.

⁹ This essay is based on the text in Goold's revised edition (1999); readings of all passages referred to or quoted in full have been checked against Fedeli's corrected version (1994) and Viarre's edition (2005). Translations of Propertius' poems are also taken from Goold (1999).

to a literary work (2.24.1–2).¹⁰ The expression ‘Cynthia’ in this context must denote the first book seen as a collection of poems centered around the persona of Cynthia; thereby this book’s distinctive feature is made clear right from the beginning. And as the first book as a whole exhibits some kind of overall structure (see ‘Structure of the book’ below), it probably was designed as a self-contained and well-structured collection by the poet. Martial uses ‘Cynthia’ to identify a literary work by Propertius in an epigram; and this epigram bears the heading ‘Monobyblos Properti’ (14.189).¹¹ ‘Cynthia’ may be a proper title or simply the first word of the collection used as a title in accordance with usual practice in the ancient world;¹² in either case it is employed to denote the collection and its subject matter.

Propertius himself mentions the first book in the second one, and he obviously assumes that it was published and read before the latter one. This is confirmed by the first poem of the second book, which seems to presuppose the circulation of and reaction to an earlier book of love elegies on Cynthia (2.1.1–4).¹³ When Propertius talks of a *liber alter* in the second book (2.3.1–4),¹⁴ that shows that each book is conceived of as a single entity; at the same time the succession of books on the same subject (the second book being *liber alter*) seems to form a complete whole. The mention of *tres . . . libelli* in the second book (2.13.25)¹⁵ can also be taken to support that idea. For instance,

¹⁰ Cf. 1.1.1: *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis, / . . .* (Cynthia first with her eyes ensnared me, poor wretch, . . .); 2.24.1–2: *‘tu loqueris, cum sis iam noto fabula libro/ et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro?’* (‘Do you talk thus, now that your famous book has made you a legend, and your “Cynthia” is read all over the forum?’).

¹¹ Cf. Mart. 14.189: ‘*Monobyblos Properti*’: *Cynthia, facundi carmen iuvenale Properti,/ accepit famam, non minus ipsa dedit.* (‘The “Monobiblos” of Propertius: Cynthia, the youthful song of eloquent Propertius, / received fame, and herself bestowed it no less. [transl. D. R. Shackleton Bailey]). On that epigram cf. Leary (1996) 253–254.

¹² Cf. e.g. Wlosok (1967) 330 and n. 1; Fedeli (1980) 11–13; (1983) 1860–1862; Holzberg (2001) 37.

¹³ Cf. 2.1.1–4: *quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores,/ unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber./ non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo:/ ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.* (You ask how it is that I compose love poems so often, how it is that my book sounds so soft upon the lips. It is not Calliope, not Apollo that puts these songs in my mind: my sweetheart herself creates the inspiration.).

¹⁴ Cf. 2.3.1–4: *qui nullam tibi dicebas iam posse nocere,/ haesisti, cecidit spiritus ille tuus!/ vix unum potes, infelix, requiescere mensem,/ et turpis de te iam liber alter erit.* (‘You were saying that no girl could hurt you now, and here you are caught! Your proud spirit has succumbed! You can scarcely keep quiet for a single month, poor wretch, and now a second book will prove a source of scandal about you.’)

¹⁵ Cf. 2.13.25–26: *sat mea, sat magnast, si tres sint pompa libelli,/ quos ego Persephona maxima dona feram.* (Enough, yes grand enough, will be my funeral train, did it

one has explained that figure by the notion that the second book was originally two books;¹⁶ it has been seen as an indication of a long-term plan of an edition of three books;¹⁷ or it has been viewed as a reference to a simultaneous edition of the first three books as transmitted, which Propertius had in mind already at the time of writing the second one.¹⁸ In any case, the first book is regarded as the first part of a larger collection.¹⁹

The fact that the first book was written first and probably published first and on its own initially, does not exclude that it may have become part of a collection of several books later on; those might have been written with the intention to complement and round off the first book, which is then regarded as the beginning of a collection. A connection across books is further suggested by the fact that the final poems of the third book (3.24–25) refer back to the first one of the first book (1.1), purporting to denote the beginning and the end of the love affair respectively, having some motifs in common and setting up designed contrasts.²⁰

The notion of this possible process is not contradicted by the evidence of Martial. The title ‘Monobiblos’ is only used by Martial;²¹ it is also found in some manuscripts of Propertius, where it could be derived from Martial.²² There is no clear proof that it is the author’s title; it will rather have originated after later publications of more of Propertius’ poetry as it is unlikely that a first and then single book should be entitled thus.²³ Moreover, it has been mentioned that this word merely denotes a book filling one volume of papyrus, and this volume does not have to be identical with Propertius’

amount to three rolls of verse for me to present to Persephone as my most precious gift.). On the meaning of *libellus* see Butler/Barber (1933) xxviii–xxix.

¹⁶ Cf., e.g., (more recently) Heyworth (1995); Günther (1997a) 6–14; Lyne (1998a) 158 and passim; Goold (1999) 13–15 and 101; cf. contra, e.g., Williams (1985) 481.

¹⁷ Cf. Wyke (1987) esp. 60–61.

¹⁸ Cf. Williams (1985) 480–495; cf. skeptical Barsby (1974); Eckert (1985) 31–33; Wyke (1987) 60–61 and n. 81.

¹⁹ Holzberg (2001) 37–38 refers the expression to a collection of books 2–4, to which the poet is looking forward (cf. also J. L. Butrica, this volume). On the problem see also Butler/Barber (1933) xxviii–xxxv.

²⁰ Cf., e.g., Heyworth (1995) 177; Goold (1999) 301 n. 70.

²¹ On the expression ‘Monobiblos’, see Brancalone (2000); on its use in connection with Propertius, cf. Henriksson (1956) 50–55. On the problem cf. also Liberman (2002) 53–56.

²² Cf. Heyworth (1995) 176; Leary (1996) 253.

²³ Cf., e.g., Butler/Barber (1933) xxxiv; Heyworth (1995) 175 and 178; Goold (1999) 15; contra cf. Birt (1882) 413–26.

first book (or one of his books); hence the expression could also refer to a selection of poems dealing with Cynthia from various books.²⁴ But the primary meaning of *monobiblos* and Martial's expression *carmen iuvenale* rather suggests a complete and self-contained work compiled by the young Propertius and thus points to the first book;²⁵ this book might have been singled out again later because of its unified appearance on account of its single theme. Thus, it may be assumed that Propertius' first book circulated separately in Martial's time (possibly in addition to larger collections).

The book's contents clearly suggest a title like 'Cynthia'. Collections of poems named after women are also attested (at least very probably) for earlier Greek poetry and Latin Neoteric poetry. They may have inspired Propertius to center his book of poems around one woman. However, as far as can be discerned, the women in these collections are not as prominent as Cynthia and the lover's feelings are in Propertius' book; these poems do not belong to the genre of 'subjective love elegy'.²⁶

Even if Cynthia opens and dominates Propertius' first book, it is not dedicated to her. It is dedicated to Tullus,²⁷ to whom the first and last poems (1.1; 1.22) are addressed (also 1.6; 1.14). Tullus functions as a model reader and a kind of contrastive foil to Propertius as he, being active in politics and warfare, represents a completely different way of life, but he does not seem to be a patron to whom Propertius is warmly attached.²⁸ The relationship is similarly noncommittal and contrastive regarding other addressees in the book: Bassus (1.4), Ponticus (1.7; 1.9), and Gallus (1.5; 1.10; 1.13; 1.20; 1.21).²⁹ The number of people referred to by the name Gallus and the identity

²⁴ Cf. Heyworth (1995) 175–78; Goold (1999) 15.

²⁵ Cf., e.g., Leary (1996) 253–54; J.L. Butrica, this volume. That Propertius will still have been technically a *iuuenis* when he published the fourth book (thus Heyworth 1995, 177), presents no problem since stress seems to be laid on the poetry Propertius wrote as a youth, that is on his first poetry.

²⁶ On differences between Greek and Roman elegy as well as between 'objective' and 'subjective love elegy', see, e.g., Luck (1969) 19–46.

²⁷ On his probable identity, see p. 224 and n. 31 below.

²⁸ See esp. Heyworth (forthcoming).

²⁹ Cf. also Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.45–48: *saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes/iure sodalicii, quo mihi iunctus erat./Ponticus heroo, Bassus quoque clarus iambis/dulcia convictus membra fuere mei.* (Oftentimes Propertius would declaim his flaming verse by right of the comradeship that joined him to me. Ponticus famed in epic, Bassus also, famed in iambics, were pleasant members of that friendly circle. [transl. A. L. Wheeler, revised by G. P. Goold]).

of the Gallus or of the two Galli are not quite certain;³⁰ the Gallus of most poems is likely to be the love poet. At any rate Bassus is an iambic poet and Ponticus an epic poet; both of them are depicted as pursuing different lines in poetry and in love. Thus Propertius positions his choice within the framework of those of his friends.

Date of composition and publication

Irrespective of later forms of publication and ways of circulation, the individual books were surely composed within subsequent periods of time. For determining the specific stretch of time they may be assigned to, the description of the development of the love affair does not offer certain clues as all may be fictitious. One instead has to look for external evidence—i.e. allusions to topical events, which are not directly related to the love affair but can establish *termini post quem* or *ante quem* for the composition of individual poems. On this basis at least, reasonably probable slots of time may be defined.

The latest datable event in the first book is referred to in elegy 1.6. In this poem Propertius says that the addressee Tullus is about to go to Asia accompanying his uncle. Tullus' uncle is usually assumed to be L. Volcatius Tullus, consul in 33 BC and serving as a proconsular governor of Asia in 30–29 BC.³¹

On the other hand, the second book presupposes the first one (and reactions to it) and suggests a relatively short interval between the two books (cf. 2.1.1–4; 2.3.1–4). As to dating the second book, its first elegy refers to Octavian's triumph in 29 BC and is addressed to Maecenas; elegy 2.31 refers to the inauguration of Apollo's temple on the Palatine by Octavian in October 28 BC.³² The last elegy

³⁰ On that issue (with further references) cf., e.g., Hubbard (1975) 25; Hutchinson (1984) 105; Nicholson (1999); Sharrock (2000) 268 n. 13; Holzberg (2001) 44–45; Miller (2004) 68–69.

³¹ Cf., e.g., Butler/Barber (1933) xxv; van Berchem (1948) 137 n. 1 and 140; Camps (1961) 6; Hubbard (1975) 42–43; Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 9; Richardson (1977) 7; Batstone (1992) 301; Goold (1999) 1. On the uncle see H. Gundel, Volcatius (9), RE IX A 1 (1961) 756–57, where his proconsulship is not mentioned; on that (with references to the relevant sources) see Lyne (1998a) 160 and n. 7; (1998b) 520–21.

³² Cf., e.g., Butler/Barber (1933) xxvi; Enk (1946) 1,16–17; van Berchem (1948) 137 n. 1; Richardson (1977) 9; Fedeli (1980) 10; (1983) 1860; Viarre (2005) xii; for skepticism on the dating of 2.31 cf. Rothstein (1920) 409–10; Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 9.

(2.34) presupposes Gallus' death in 26 BC;³³ elegy 2.10 refers forward to an expedition undertaken in 25 BC.³⁴ It is therefore assumed that the first book appeared before October 28 BC (cf. 2.31). Octavian's triumph (cf. 2.1) is then included in the second book as a recent event and could have been talked about in the first book if that were in line with its general idea. But in the first book Propertius mentions neither Maecenas nor Octavian in contrast to subsequent books; that is another hint that the book probably was completed before thoughts of Propertius entering Maecenas' circle came up and before Octavian acquired complete power.³⁵ That gives an approximate date of some point around the end of 29 or the beginning of 28 BC for completion and publication of the first book.³⁶ By pointing to allusions in Vergil's *Georgics*, probably published around August 29 BC, one has even tried to narrow the period to that between August 29 and spring 28 BC.³⁷

The rough dating of the completion of the first book does not say anything about dates of composition for individual poems. They need not have been written in the order in which they appear in the final collection, and some could have been written considerably earlier than the completion of the book. The rival mentioned in elegy 1.8 is probably the praetor from Illyria (cf. 2.16); then this poem must be later than the Illyrian war of 34 BC. Other elegies lack precise references to historical events and therefore cannot be assigned to absolute dates.

The approximate absolute dating of Propertius' first book means that it was completed before the first book of elegies by the contemporary elegiac poet Tibullus. For Tibullus' first book cannot have appeared before 27 BC, since his elegy 1.7 mentions the triumph celebrated by his patron Messalla on 25 September 27 BC; it probably was published in 26 BC. In the traditional canon of Roman

³³ Cf., e.g., Enk (1946) 1,18; Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 9.

³⁴ Cf., e.g., Butler/Barber (1933) xxv–xxvi; Enk (1946) 1,17–18; Richardson (1977) 9; Batstone (1992) 301.

³⁵ Cf., e.g., Birt (1882) 413; Butler/Barber (1933) xxvii; Goold (1999) 1–2 and 37. On Propertius' relationship to Maecenas see now Heyworth (forthcoming), challenging the traditional view; cf. also Viarre (2005) xiv.

³⁶ Cf., e.g., Butler/Barber (1933) xxv–xxviii; Enk (1946) 1,16–17; van Berchem (1948) 137; Otis (1965) 2 n. 4 (36–37); Wlosok (1967) 330; Michelfeit (1969) 354 n. 14; King (1975) 109; Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 9; Richardson (1977) 7–8; Fedeli (1980) 10; (1983) 1858 and 1860; D'Anna (1986) 53; Holzberg (1990) 27 and 36; Batstone (1992) 301–302; Goold (1999) 1; Baker (2000) 1 and 4; Viarre (2005) xii.

³⁷ Cf. Batstone (1992) 301–302. For 30/29 BC see Luther (2003).

elegists, however, if there is an explicit chronological order as in Ovid (*Tr.* 4.10.51–54), Tibullus comes before Propertius.³⁸ That is probably due to the dates of their deaths and Ovid's experience of them, but not to the probable order of publication of their books: Propertius' first book is followed by Tibullus' first one, which in turn is followed by Propertius' next one.³⁹

Themes and motifs

As the first word of the first poem and of the first book indicates, the figure of Cynthia and the persona's love for her are the book's main themes. And indeed, although love is an important feature of all of Propertius' books, it is most prominent in the first one. Besides the introductory poem, the dominance of Cynthia is directly avowed by the lover later in the book (1.12.19–20): *mi neque amare aliam neque ab hac desistere fas est:/ Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit* (For me it is not ordained to love another or to break with her: Cynthia was the first, Cynthia shall be the last.). Although this statement is made while the lover is lonely and stresses his affection for Cynthia, it can be taken as programmatic in connection with the contents of the book.⁴⁰

Cynthia is actually named in thirteen out of the transmitted twenty-two elegies in the first book (1.1; 1.3; 1.4; 1.5; 1.6; 1.8; 1.10; 1.11; 1.12; 1.15; 1.17; 1.18; 1.19); and of the love elegies that do not name Cynthia, some certainly refer to her (e.g., 1.2; 1.7; 1.16), possibly all except the last three poems. That Propertius' poetry and probably especially the first book (cf. 14.189) give the impression that Cynthia is the center of Propertius' poems is testified to by Martial (8.73.5).⁴¹

³⁸ Cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.51–54: *nec avara Tibullo/tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae/(successor fuit hic tibi, Galle, Propertius illi;/ quartus ab his serie temporis ipse fui)*. (. . . , and to Tibullus greedy fate gave no time for friendship with me (Tibullus was thy successor, Gallus, and Propertius his; after them came I, fourth in order of time). [transl. A. L. Wheeler, revised by G. P. Goold]).

³⁹ Cf., e.g., van Berchem (1948) 137; Otis (1965) 2 n. 4 (36–37); Richardson (1977) 14; Fedeli (1983) 1860; Lyne (1998b); Goold (1999) 4–5.

⁴⁰ Lycinna, who has introduced the lover to the art of love (cf. 3.15.1–12), is a minor figure and does not really count. cf. also Viarre (2005) ix.

⁴¹ Cf. Mart. 8.73.5: *Cynthia te vatem fecit, lascive Properti;/ . . .* (Cynthia made you a poet, sprightly Propertius; . . . [transl. D. R. Shackleton Bailey]).

‘Cynthia’ is identified as a pseudonym for ‘Hostia’ by Apuleius (*Apol.* 10).⁴² Irrespective of whether this identification is correct or not, Cynthia as she appears in Propertius’ poetry certainly is not a ‘real woman’. The name ‘Cynthia’ is derived from the hill Cynthus on the isle of Delos, the birthplace of the gods Apollo and Diana, and thus triggers allusions to poetry and perhaps especially to Callimachus, who uses the epithet ‘Kynthios’ for Apollo a few times. It has even been questioned whether a real person is behind the stylized treatment at all; it has been thought that everything is completely fictitious and that Cynthia is a construct of written poetry, simply narrative *materia* or a symbol for Propertius’ poetry.⁴³ However, it is still possible that some real experience has been the starting point for Propertius’ poetry and Cynthia’s role in it. In any case, the love affair as described in the book is not to be understood biographically, even if the arrangement of poems suggests a development from sudden enslavement (1.1) to final separation (3.24–25).

In the description of the relationship to Cynthia all major characteristics of Roman love elegy can be found fully established for the first time: Cynthia embodies all characteristics of a typical *domina* in an elegiac love relationship. The lover is enslaved to his *saeva puella* and is in the state of *servitium amoris*; he experiences a desperate and despairing love for this lady; he is fighting like a soldier of love (*militia amoris*). Right from the beginning his miserableness is stressed; in the first line already there is a pointed contrast between the powerful Cynthia and the miserable lover (1.1.1). Besides, the lover also reflects on his love and acts as a kind of *praeceptor amoris* to his friends.

Although Propertius’ relationship to Cynthia is closely connected to his achievements as a poet, in the first poem (1.1) he explicitly introduces himself in his capacity as a suffering lover only (see ‘Poetics’ below). He contradicts all traditional Roman values, establishes a distance from the political world of Rome, and opts for a life totally

⁴² Cf. Apul. *Apol.* 10: *eadem igitur opera accusent . . . et Propertium, qui Cynthia dicat, Hostiam dissimulet, . . .* (But in the same manner let my opponents accuse . . ., and Propertius for speaking of ‘Cynthia’ while not naming Hostia, . . . [transl. V. Hunink]). cf. also Viarre (2005) ix–xii.

⁴³ Thus Wyke (1987) for books 2–4; extended to the first book by McNamee (1993) and Greene (1995); (1998); cf. also Sharrock (2000); Miller (2004) 60–73. For some general thoughts on Cynthia and the ‘sincerity’ of Roman love poets, cf. Allen (1962).

dedicated to love.⁴⁴ That is clearly implied in the first poem already and established further in elegy 1.6. These ideas are conveyed by a number of formal features and motifs characteristic of Augustan love elegy and adapted to Propertius' purposes, like paraclausithyron, dangers caused by a rival or laments over the lady's harshness.

Even if Cynthia is the theme of most of the book's poems, their greater part is not addressed to her, but to friends of Propertius.⁴⁵ This feature places Propertius' love and his poetry within contemporary reality and presents it from various perspectives; for it has the persona not only address poems to his beloved, but also talk to other addressees about her and his love, for example by comparing his situation as an elegiac lover to the way of life of his friends. Thereby the lover-poet reflects on his condition self-consciously and ironically; he depicts the love affair from within and from without.

Only the last three poems of the book (one mythological piece and two personal epigrams) do not deal with the persona's love to Cynthia; they may instead follow Hellenistic conventions more closely; they imitate the form of the main models, but avoid the Propertian topic of love. Nevertheless, these poems are integral parts of the book at the same time as they continue some of its main themes (see 'Structure of the book' below). That is especially true for the last one, which rounds off the book, as it is addressed to Tullus like the first one and similarly deals with the persona's personal situation.

Structure of the book

As the collection of poems forming the first book probably was put together by the poet himself, and as concern with artistic form and arrangement is a general feature of Hellenistic and Augustan poetry, people have tried to determine the guiding principles according to which the book might be organised.⁴⁶ Although various theories on that problem have been put forward and details are still being debated,

⁴⁴ On this issue see van Berchem (1948); Steidle (1962).

⁴⁵ Cf., e.g., Hubbard (1975) 24–25; Sharrock (2000) 266–68.

⁴⁶ On that issue cf. esp. Ites (1908) 2–17; Skutsch (1963); Otis (1965); Courtney (1968); Michelfeit (1969) 354–55 (and on the problem in general); Hering (1973); King (1975); Davis (1977) 27–30; Fedeli (1980) 13–17; (1983) 1862–1865; Petersmann (1980) includes overview of earlier discussions; Eckert (1985) (includes overview of earlier discussions); Holzberg (1990) 29–35; Goold (1999) 5–7; Baker (2000) 12–14; Rambaux (2001b) 83–91; Liberman (2002) 50–53.

it is at least generally assumed that the book forms a self-contained unit and is based on some kind of deliberate structure; only rarely are such efforts dismissed as schemes that gratify an “undisciplined desire for tidiness”.⁴⁷ Certainly, aiming at a mathematically exact sequence and perhaps even altering the text to achieve it might be somewhat far-fetched; but a general well-ordered structure of the book is obvious.

The book as transmitted consists of 22 elegies, giving a total of 706 lines; the division of poems in the manuscripts, however, is not everywhere reliable (see ‘Note on the text’ above). A number of scholars since Lipsius have divided the eighth elegy (1.8) into two separate poems (1.8A; 1.8B), forming a pair and paralleling 1.11 and 1.12.⁴⁸ Because of several formal markers in favor of it, that division is preferable to keeping 1.8 as transmitted and combining 1.11 and 1.12 into one poem instead.⁴⁹ This poem division gives a total of 23 poems (numbered 1.1–22 and 1.8 being counted as 1.8A and 1.8B), of which the last three are not concerned with the persona’s love to Cynthia.

As for the structure of the whole book, the solution first proposed by O. Skutsch (1963) has won widespread acceptance (with different degrees of modification): in addition to the first and the last elegies, which provide a framework to the book, the dedicatee Tullus is also addressed in elegies 1.6 and 1.14. This spacing establishes a middle panel and makes poems 1.1–19 fall into three groups: 1.1–5; 1.6–14; 1.15–19, the middle section in itself being split into two halves (1.6–9; 1.10–14). Thus these twenty love poems (1.8 being counted as 1.8A and 1.8B) are divided into four symmetrically arranged panels of equal length (five poems each); they are followed by three poems not dealing with Cynthia (1.20–22). Schematically, that leads to the following arrangement (based on the transmitted text): A¹ (1.1–5) + B¹ (1.6–9) + B² (1.10–14) + A² (1.15–19) + C (1.20–22) = 176 (A¹) + 142 (B¹) + 140 (B²) + 176 (A²) + 72 (C) lines; at the same time

⁴⁷ Thus Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 10–13.

⁴⁸ Cf., e.g., Ites (1908) 6–7; Butler/Barber (1933) 11–12 and 166; Camps (1961) 25–26 and 64; Fedeli (1980) 38–39 and 201–08; Goold (1999) 58–63; cf. contra (one elegy) Enk (1946) 1,139–41; 2,74–75; Michelfeit (1969) 356 n. 16; Davis (1977) 27; Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 31–33 and 120–21; Richardson (1977) 41–42 and 166; Viarre (2005) 11–13.

⁴⁹ Thus Butrica (1996); followed by Holzberg (2001) 39–40. On the problem cf. Jäger (1967) 47–55 and 99–105; Davis (1977) 27–50.

A roughly equals B + C ($352 \approx 282 + 72$ lines). The transmitted text, however, does not give completely exact correspondences. In connection with that, it has been suggested that the couplet 1.7.23–24 had its origin outside the first book and should be deleted where it stands, which would result in a perfect equation.⁵⁰ That deletion may be tempting, but the lines make sense at their transmitted position. Thus, if one does not resort to other changes in the text, one has to accept that correspondences are not exact.⁵¹

At any rate, formal considerations of numerical correspondence should not prevent an assessment of the poems themselves, but rather support it. The book's thematic structure (irrespective of numbers of lines or poems) agrees with the arrangement of poems within the groups and of the groups in relation to each other: in the middle section the two poems addressed to Tullus (1.6; 1.14) enclose one set of poems addressed to Ponticus (1.7; 1.9) and one set of poems addressed to Gallus (1.10; 1.13), dealing with the love of these men; each time the second poem is a sequel to the first one, while the middle of each group consists of two poems dealing with the lover's (possible) separation from Cynthia. The surrounding sections are not arranged symmetrically in that way,⁵² but rather in linear progression and held together by their general subject matter.

And although the book may be seen as consisting of individual and partly self-contained sections, it does not fall into unconnected bits. For at the same time the book as a whole can be viewed as a sophisticated and unified demonstration of why and in what way Propertius is committed to love and to love poetry and as a gradually proceeding movement in a sequence of linear progression.⁵³

⁵⁰ Cf. Courtney (1968); Günther (1997a) 131; Goold (1999) 5/7.

⁵¹ Habinek (1982) has even thought that the number of couplets in the whole book (354 in the text taken as the basis) corresponded to the days of the lunar year, and that was appropriate for a woman named in part for the goddess of the moon and for a relationship that is said to have been going on just for one year in the introductory poem (1.1.7). As Cynthia could also be understood as a poetic metaphor, a year with such a woman corresponded to a book of that length. The given number of lines with that meaning implied could be seen as a technical feat in accordance with Alexandrian poetics. But there are no further hints to prove that such a connection is intended.

⁵² Otis' attempt (1965) to find exact correspondences between poems in each part, even with respect to their number of lines, appears to be somewhat problematic in some cases.

⁵³ Cf., e.g., King (1975); Petersmann (1980); Hutchinson (1984); Eckert (1985) 159–182; cf. contra Hering (1973); Fedeli (1974) 37; Rambaux (2001b).

first Propertius' new love affair is described and introduced; then he defines his corresponding poetic stance; then he begins to discuss problems of a love affair using examples of his friends; finally he demonstrates the problems of his own love affair, involving separation and death; and lastly he enlarges on this subject on the basis of personal experiences.

The three final poems, however, have often been regarded as an 'appendix' or a 'coda or superstructure' and treated as such, but there is no reason to doubt that they belong to the book: the first and the last poems of the book are addressed to the same person (1.1; 1.22), and the first book closes with a personal sphragis in Hellenistic tradition, which refers back to the personal introduction of the lover in the first poem. In ending with short and personal pieces Propertius might continue a tradition inherited from the elegiac poet Gallus.⁵⁴ In a linear reading of the book these last poems work as a logical continuation of the preceding poems since they take up the themes of death and separation introduced in the foregoing group.⁵⁵

Overview of the book's contents

How the structure outlined above works in detail and what the book is about shall be illustrated by a short overview of the book's contents, organized according to the structural units suggested.

The first book begins with an introductory and programmatic poem addressed to its dedicatee Tullus (1.1). In this poem the lover makes it clear that he has been captured by Cynthia and Amor for the first time and is miserably enslaved to Cynthia now. He cannot find any remedy against his situation and warns others against the same fate. The first poem starts off the first and introductory section of the book, which defines the relationship between lover and beloved (as dangerous and miserable for the lover) and sets it against opinions of others (1.1–5).

The second poem (1.2) is addressed to Cynthia although she is not named; the lover protests against her overdressing and extensive

⁵⁴ Cf. Petersmann (1980) 222; (1983) 1653–1654; cf. also Hutchinson (1984) 103.

⁵⁵ Cf., e.g., King (1975) 110; Petersmann (1980) 222; cf. also Nicholson (1999).

use of make-up; thus both the beloved and the expectations of the lover are described. After the lover and his beloved Cynthia have been introduced each on their own in the first and second poems respectively, the next elegy (1.3) brings the two together: drunk and late at night the lover comes to Cynthia and finds her asleep. When the moonlight wakes Cynthia, she charges him with having stayed away so long and possibly having enjoyed himself with another girl; her jealous reaction implies that she also loves him, although she does not say so. After the love relationship has been characterized by showing the two in interaction, the next two poems react to other people's views on love. In poem 1.4 the lover deals with Bassus' suggestion to try other girls; he, however, extols Cynthia and promises to keep to her. In the following elegy (1.5) the lover warns his friend Gallus to aspire to a relationship with Cynthia because that makes one unhappy and asks for great sacrifices; thereby he shows himself aware of the elegiac lover's typical miserableness.

The next poem (1.6) starts off a new section, in which the persona's position as regards his way of life and his style of poetry is defined by being contrasted to those of his friends (1.6–14). This section is divided into two symmetrical parts (1.6–9; 1.10–14), the first one focusing on poetics and the second one on the situation of the lover. In elegy 1.6, again addressed to Tullus (cf. 1.1), the speaker encourages Tullus to go on a mission to Asia and win political success like his uncle, but clearly states that he will not be able to accompany Tullus as his beloved detains him. Thereby he decides against a political career and for a privately organized life. As a kind of complement on the poetological level, he contrasts the epic poetry of his friend Ponticus with his own elegiac love poetry in the next poem (1.7); he makes it clear that he tries to achieve fame by his kind of poetry. The sequence of reflecting poems is interrupted by a pair of two poems illustrating what the speaker's love is like: in the first poem of the pair (1.8A) the persona charges Cynthia with intending to follow another man to Illyria; the second one (1.8B) presents the result, the lover's relief that his entreaties have been successful and Cynthia is going to stay with him. At any rate, these poems show that the love affair is constantly subject to the danger of separation of the lovers. In elegy 1.9 the persona returns to the addressee Ponticus, the epic poet (cf. 1.7), who has now fallen in love as well, and tries to persuade him to change to the appropriate kind of poetry accordingly.

The following elegy (1.10), the first one of the middle section's second part, is addressed to another friend, Gallus (cf. 1.5), and describes how the speaker (as an observer) participated in the first night of Gallus and his girl. The experiences of his own love and that of his friend lead him to reinforce his position as a *praeceptor amoris*. The next two elegies (1.11–12) are linked to each other like 1.8A and 1.8B and have the same position within the subsection. Again, after talking to a friend, the lover presents his own love affair. In elegy 1.11 Cynthia is supposed to be at Baiae; the lover fears that she will forget him and be drawn toward another man; he stresses his affection solely for her. In elegy 1.12 the lover laments his loneliness and even more strongly avows that he does not love anybody else. In contrast to poems 1.8A and 1.8B, the persona is really separated from his beloved now. Just as with Ponticus (cf. 1.7; 1.9), he then comes back to the addressee Gallus (1.13, cf. 1.10); this poem is closely connected with the preceding ones, as the lover's loneliness is mentioned as a starting point in the first lines. The speaker hopes that Gallus is more successful than he is and wishes Gallus good luck for his new love affair. The middle section as a whole is rounded off by another poem addressed to Tullus (1.14; cf. 1.6), presenting the result of their differing decisions for a specific way of life: Tullus is enjoying his wealth and his power, Propertius his love, but he is satisfied with it and feels no inclination to change.

The second half of the middle section (1.10–14), which at the same time constitutes the first part of the second half of the book's love poems, indicates that love to Cynthia is becoming more and more problematic as the book proceeds. Accordingly, the last section of love poems (1.15–19) deals with the possible separation of the lovers. This group thus corresponds to the first five poems of the book, which introduce the love affair conveying a rather optimistic outlook. In elegy 1.15 the lover is disappointed by Cynthia's *perfidia*. In poem 1.16 a door to the beloved's house speaks and relates the lover's unsuccessful attempts to get into it. In poem 1.17 the lover is separated from his beloved as he has gone on a sea journey, and he fears that he will have to be buried abroad and without attendance of his mistress; this poem is thus a counterpart to elegies 1.8A–8B and 1.11–12, where it is the beloved who has gone away or is about to do so. In the next elegy (1.18) the lover continues to bewail his loneliness in a solitary place. He stresses that he is willing to follow all Cynthia's wishes and asks for the reason of

their estrangement. In elegy 1.19 the lover voices his fear that he might be buried without Cynthia's love, that means that she will not attend his funeral, he will lack her love after death, and she will choose another partner. This somewhat gloomy poem ends via a positive turn with the urge to enjoy love and life while one can; that looks back in a way to the first poem that introduces the love affair; in contrast to the disappointments described earlier at least the desire to enjoy is being voiced now.

The book's final three poems (1.20–22), which do not concern the persona's love to Cynthia, are connected with the rest of the book by addressees and some aspects of subject matter. The first poem of this group (1.20) is again addressed to Gallus and takes up the idea that he is in love (cf. 1.10; 1.13), with a boy this time. In order to show what can happen to a lover, the poet tells the mythological story of Hylas. In poem 1.21 a dead Gallus⁵⁶ talks to a soldier passing by and tells his fate. The last poem (1.22) is addressed to Tullus like the first one (1.1), whereby the book is rounded off. Tullus is envisaged to inquire about Propertius' origin. The speaker gives Umbria as his birthplace, mentioning a kinsman's death in Etruria nearby (possibly the dead Gallus of the preceding poem). Thus the book closes with a personal sphragis.

Poetics

In the first book Propertius does not talk about his poetic stance explicitly or in poems entirely devoted to that topic as he does in later books (cf., e.g., 2.1; 2.34; 3.1; 3.3; 4.1); nevertheless, his position becomes fairly clear by implication and by way of allusions within the framework of the poetics of his day.⁵⁷

First of all, it is evident that the love relationship directly bears on the poetry: the speaker makes it clear that he has chosen to write love poetry; Cynthia is the source of his inspiration and the subject of his poetry; she herself has gifts for music and learned conversation;

⁵⁶ On the identity of 'Gallus', see pp. 223–24 above and n. 30.

⁵⁷ On literary and poetological aspects in the first book (in contrast to later ones), see Fedeli (1981); D'Anna (1986).

his poems are to have an effect on her; he and she will thereby become famous.⁵⁸

The conscious choice for love poetry becomes even more apparent when the persona contrasts his poetry with that of his friends, especially with that of the epic poet Ponticus (cf. 1.7; 1.9); thus poetological statements are not independent, but closely connected to the topic of love. In these poems the lover stresses that, partly willingly and partly by the force of love, he has devoted himself to tender love poetry, centered around his beloved Cynthia. He will remain faithful to his decision and sets himself apart from his friends, who cultivate poetry in other genres; he does not feel any inclination to change to their genre, but rather envisages that they might need to have recourse to love poetry at some stage.

Such statements fix the persona's position within the range of different literary genres, though not with respect to his poetic principles within the chosen genre and his relationship to possible predecessors. As can be inferred from later elegies, the speaker considers his elegiac poetry a logical continuation of the Alexandrian and Neoteric poetic tradition (cf. 2.34). But whereas in other books the first poem in its programmatic position is used for poetological statements, in the first book Propertius merely talks about the effects of his love in that poem.⁵⁹ Only by implication does his poetic stance become clear, (apart from the fact that his love causes his poetry) as the first four lines are inspired by a poem by Meleager (cf. *Anth. Pal.* 12.101), and as the mythological comparison used later in the poem might have been employed by earlier poets (e.g., Gallus) in a different way, against which Propertius sets his own version. Thus, awareness of the intertextual framework turns out to be an important clue to understanding Propertius' poetry and poetics.

The only Greek lyric poet mentioned in the first book is Mimnermus, who is contrasted with Homer (1.9.11); this reference is rather functional and serves to reinforce the contrast between epic and love poetry. No Hellenistic poet is named; only by taking up telling motifs from Hellenistic predecessors like Meleager does the speaker make it clear that he aligns himself with them. He even draws on a wider

⁵⁸ Cf. 1.2.27–30; 1.7.5–14; 1.8.39–42; 1.11.7–8; cf. also 2.1.1–4; 2.3.1–4; 2.8.11; 2.24.17–22; 2.34.93–94; 3.2.15–18; 4.7.49–50.

⁵⁹ Cf., e.g., Holzberg (2001) 37–38.

range of Hellenistic poets than those playing a prominent role in later books like Callimachus or Philotas.

Mythological exempla

A conspicuous feature of Propertius' poetry is his abundant use of refined mythological exempla, which is apparent in the first book as well as in other ones (cf., e.g., 1.1.9–16; 1.2.15–24; 1.3.1–6; 1.4.5–10; 1.15.9–22).⁶⁰ Propertius often only alludes to a mythological story or refers to a less well-known version and expects his readers to grasp the point. He does not use mythological exempla to show off his learning, but they are usually closely connected with the message of the poem. They often illustrate features of the love affair and thereby dignify it. For instance, right in the first poem of the first book (1.1), which introduces and characterizes the love affair, a rare version of the story of Milanion and Atalanta is used in order to illustrate specific characteristics of the persona's situation as a lover of the *domina* Cynthia. This use of mythology is one of the telling elements that clearly show Propertius to be a *poeta doctus*.

Style

In many respects the style of the first book is not different from that of the later books. This book nevertheless exhibits its own distinctive appearance on account of theme and presentation. Naturally, by its concentration on Cynthia it is the most unified book.

Regarding the individual poems, the view has long been held that abrupt changes of thought are widespread in Propertius, but it has now been established, at least for the first book, that most elegies are clearly structured. These poems are organized in a series of short and well discernible parts; additionally, the sections are often arranged in a patterned structure, resulting in correspondences between the various parts or in a symmetrical arrangement around an axis ('stanzaic composition').⁶¹ That is in line with an argumentative structure

⁶⁰ Cf., e.g., Allen (1962) 129–45.

⁶¹ Cf., e.g., Tordeur (1988); Günther (1997a) 133–156; skeptical Hubbard (1975) 18–19; Fedeli (1980) 61–62; on a content-based unity, cf. Lefèvre (1977).

of many poems, which may be explained by an influence of rhetoric. In contrast to later books there are no particularly long poems; no poem exceeds the length of 52 lines (1.20). Another noteworthy feature is the 'hortatory' character of the first book as each poem has its addressee.⁶²

One notable stylistic feature is the marked difference in metrical technique between the poems of the first book and those of the following ones: there is a significant decrease in pentameters ending in polysyllabic words from the first to the following books.⁶³ This progression is sometimes attributed to the influence of Tibullus, whose metrical technique Propertius might have adopted after having started in the style of Catullus; it may therefore be interpreted as a sign of development of the genre.

Example: elegy 1.3

The preceding more general remarks on the first book shall be complemented by a closer look at elegy 1.3; this poem has often been regarded as a masterpiece⁶⁴ and shall therefore serve as a sample poem to be discussed in greater detail.⁶⁵ The analysis is designed to give an overview of the poem's position within the collection, its contents, structure, line of thought, and the characteristics of the love affair it shows. This splendid poem has been discussed particularly often and with various kinds of approaches (traditional, mythological, artistic, based on modern literary theories, intertextual, linguistic,

⁶² Cf., e.g., Butler/Barber (1933) lxii–lxiii; Richardson (1977) 14–15 and 25; Warden (1980) 85–111.

⁶³ Cf., e.g., Hodge/Buttimore (1977) 10; Richardson (1977) 23; Fedeli (1994) 286; Goold (1999) 5 and 37.

⁶⁴ Contra only Veyne (1988) 52: "This, I suggest, is the explanation for Propertius' enigmatic poem 1.3, whose mystery is due perhaps only to clumsiness. At first the poet seems to tell of some incident; the reader waits for the epilogue, which does not come because in reality the poet is describing a typical relationship between two lovers, the Unfaithful Man and the Abandoned Beauty. Unfortunately, instead of using the repetitive imperfect tense, this state is described in terms of the past tense for completed events. . . . But the anecdote is so badly told that we wonder whether we should not look for a peripeteia between the lines. The lack of clarity, so frequent in Propertius, is at its height here."

⁶⁵ Elegy 1.3 exerted great influence on Johann Wolfgang von Goethe; his poem 'Der Besuch' (1788) is inspired by it (for a brief comparison of the two poems, see Herwig-Hager 1965).

feminist, structuralist).⁶⁶ The following analysis tries to present a fairly unprejudiced picture, keeping as close as possible to what the text itself says.

Elegy 1.3 narrates a meeting between lover and beloved: when he returns drunk and late at night, he finds her asleep, does not have the courage to wake her, enjoys looking at the sleeping girl until the light of the moon wakes her and she charges him with being late. While elegies 1.1–2 present the lover and the beloved each on their own, the third poem is the first to show both protagonists in interaction; these three poems thus form a closely connected introductory group (within the book's first major section). The third poem stands out for another reason as well: it is the only one in the first book that does not consist of hortatory addresses and reflections by the speaker. It rather is a sequential narration of a series of events even if the narrative proper begins somewhat delayed as the setting of the scene starts off with an extended mythological comparison.⁶⁷ Further, Cynthia's name is mentioned here for the first time after its programmatic use in the first line of the book (1.1.1). Although elegy 1.2 probably refers to Cynthia (who cares too much for her outward appearance in the eyes of the lover), in the third poem she appears as a 'real' person for the first time, has the chance to present herself by a direct speech, is mentioned by name, and enters into a direct relationship with the lover.

Thus elegy 1.3 is an important starting point as it sets the scene for the description of the development of the love affair in the poems to follow and serves as a paradigmatic illustration. More specifically, this poem presents the sufferings of a lover of Cynthia, against which the persona warns Gallus in elegy 1.5. The poem also shows the persona's choice to live as an elegiac lover in contrast to ways of

⁶⁶ In addition to the standard commentaries (see p. 220 n. 4) cf. (with further references) esp. Birt (1895); Lieberg (1961); Allen (1962) 130–134; Klingner (1965); Curran (1966); Wlosok (1967); Lyne (1970); Hering (1972); Fedeli (1974); (1983) 1871–1875; Giangrande (1974) 29–35; Harmon (1974); Hubbard (1975) 19–22; Cairns (1977) 330–337; Petersmann (1978); (1980) 31–40 (expanded version); Baker (1980); Weiden (1980) 31–41; Dunn (1985) 239–50; Eckert (1985) 72–91; van der Paardt (1985); Noonan (1991); Harrison (1994); Greene (1995) 305–09; (1998) 51–59; Kaufhold (1997); Tatham (2000); Booth (2001b); Georg (2001) 124–33 (deletes 1.3.5–6, 21–30, 37–38, 41–46); Giuliadori (2001); Rambaux (2001b) 27–29; Miller (2002) 58–59, 170–74.

⁶⁷ Cf. Curran (1966) 190; Warden (1980) 89; Greene (1995) 306.

life other people have decided on (esp. 1.6; 1.14). That lover and beloved do not properly unite contrasts with Gallus and his girl, who spent the night together and enjoy themselves (1.10). The separation between lover and beloved in this poem is similar and at the same time different from poems where the poet is in fact alone and far away from his beloved or threatened by separation (1.8; 1.11–12; 1.17–19).

The poem centers around the motif of the lover who finds his beloved asleep.⁶⁸ Propertius probably is not the first poet to use it; the motif might have its origin in Greek epigrams; the *Anthologia Palatina* has a comparable epigram by Paulus Silentiarius (6th cent. AD), who is probably employing a traditional motif (cf. *Anth. Pal.* 5.275): in this poem the lover finds his beloved asleep, climbs on to her bed and starts to make love; the girl wakes up and accuses him of having achieved what she has previously refused; she fears that he will now move on to another girl.⁶⁹ As Propertius' more refined version markedly differs in its employment of the motif and in formal outline (including pictorial and mythological illustrations) and, most importantly, gives his beloved the character of a *domina* to whom the lover is enslaved, a common source has been thought to be more likely than that Paulus Silentiarius imitates Propertius. Then Propertius had not just chosen any motif that suited his purposes for this poem, but had positioned himself within the context of predecessors by alluding to intertextual connections and at the same time presented his own distinctive treatment. In his changes and additions to the basic outline of the story he may also refer to Roman predecessors.

Propertius' poem exhibits an artistic structure and can be divided into several sections, corresponding to each other and relating to the lover and to Cynthia respectively.⁷⁰ Out of the large number of

⁶⁸ A variant treatment of this topic is given in 2.29, which leads to nice contrasts (cf., e.g., Goold 1999, 191 n. 71; Giuliiodori 2001, 218).

⁶⁹ On this issue cf. Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 156–69; Hubbard (1975) 20–21; Yardley (1980); Goold (1999) 45 n. 9; Giuliiodori (2001) 203–04. The motif of the moonshine in an erotic context may be connected with another epigram in the *Anthologia Palatina* (*Anth. Pal.* 5.123) by Philodemus (cf. Booth 2001b; Giuliiodori 2001, 211).

⁷⁰ For various proposals cf., e.g., Curran (1966) 190; Wlosok (1967) esp. 350–51; Lyne (1970); Fedeli (1974) 23–24; (1980) 112–13; Richardson (1977) 153; Petersmann (1978); Dunn (1985) 245–50; Baker (2000) 76.

different structural models that have been proposed the following one appears to bear out convincingly the poem's refined structure as it shows that the poem as a whole is structured symmetrically around an axis.⁷¹

The poem opens with a first part consisting of six couplets setting the scene (1.3.1–12), its first half (1.3.1–6) describing Cynthia's situation and its second half the lover's arrival and spontaneous reaction provoked by it (1.3.7–12). These six couplets of the first part correspond to the six couplets of the final part (1.3.35–46); in its first half Cynthia reproaches the interlocutor (1.3.35–40), and in its second half she talks about her own situation while she has been waiting for the lover (1.3.41–46). That means that these two parts of equal length complement each other, as the first part is focused on the lover and the final part on the beloved. The poem's last lines, describing how Cynthia has fallen asleep in the absence of her lover, correspond to the sleeping Cynthia at the beginning. However, that is no simple return to the situation at the beginning since the atmosphere has progressed from an idyllic to a tense situation in the meantime.

The first and final parts surround the middle section (1.3.13–34), in which the perspective changes from the lover to Cynthia. The middle part in itself can be divided into three sections; two pieces of identical length, of four couplets each (1.3.13–20; 27–34), surround a passage exactly in the middle of the elegy of three couplets (1.3.21–26). In the first section of the middle part (1.3.13–20) the affectionate excitement of the lover abates; although he desires to embrace his beloved, he decides, out of his experience of the *saeva domina*, to hold himself back and merely to watch her. At any rate, he has turned his attention to his beloved, and in the poem's central lines he woos the sleeping Cynthia by presenting gifts to her (1.3.21–26). In the third section (1.3.27–34) the lover is still speaking about his actions and feelings, but Cynthia begins to move and to sigh while still sleeping; anxiously and jealously he reflects on her feelings. Thus, the focus changes to Cynthia, which, in the course of the poem, provokes her speech that closes the elegy (1.3.35–46).

The poem's line of thought in greater detail: The first section (1.3.1–6) describes the sleeping Cynthia by way of a triple compar-

⁷¹ Mainly based on Wlosok (1967).

ison with mythological heroines, which might be triggered by Propertius' great sensitivity and pictorial imagination. The three fairly well-known heroines are not simply referred to by their names, but they are identified by learned allusions to their fathers or countries; and their stories are not told in full, only certain instances are highlighted; so the *poeta doctus* makes the reader decipher the context.⁷² The main point of comparison is not each heroine's fate as a whole, but the specific way of their sleeping or lying down. Thus, each comparison contributes to the general picture of Cynthia aimed at and has its function within the poem: she is relaxed and lonely, free and safe as well as exhausted. In this respect there is a gradual climax, which is finally taken up in Cynthia's *mollis quies* (1.3.7), which summarizes the ideas evoked by the mythological heroines. By a harsh contrast this peaceful picture is disrupted by the entrance of the drunken lover in the next section (1.3.7–12). It is, however, closely linked to the preceding passage, as *talis* (1.3.7) takes up the comparisons and relates them to the actual situation of the lovers, and Cynthia's gentle sleep (cf. 1.3.7) corresponds to the lover's gentle approach (cf. 1.3.12).⁷³

After the general situation has been established, the lover's psychological state is being described in the middle part of the poem (1.3.13–34): the lover is caught in a conflict between his present desires and his previous experiences of the *saeva puella*. As a result he restrains himself, not because it would be unfair to take advantage of the situation, but out of fear and respect of the *domina*. At first he can only look intensely at his beloved; at some point, however, he starts to act and to make use of the unique opportunity. His actions are shown in the central part of the poem (1.3.21–26); only there is 'Cynthia' used as an address (1.3.22). A change from

⁷² The reader's awareness of earlier treatments of the mythological heroines, like Catullus' Ariadne story (ca. 64), is probably assumed; Catullus' poem is referred to by verbal reminiscences (cf., e.g., Curran (1966) 196; Wlosok (1967) 338–39; Fedeli (1980) 110–11; Harrison (1994) 19). Influence of Calvus and other Neoteric poets might also be detected (cf. P. Knox, this volume).

⁷³ This division into parts has been criticized because of the fact that lines 1.3.11–12 belonged to the next section (cf. Fedeli (1974) 23; (1980) 112–13). It certainly is true that these lines start the description of the lover's actions when being confronted with Cynthia. On the other hand, the couplet closes the introduction as it describes how the lover comes close to Cynthia. But from the next line onward, his actions toward her are being narrated. This division would make the passage start with *et* (1.3.13) like the two subsequent subsections (cf. 1.3.21; 1.3.27).

the third to the second person occurs; that the garlands are given from the lover to his beloved illustrates the switch of focus. The lover is wooing his beloved; but there are no reactions from the sleeping girl; on the other hand he can incessantly care for her without having to fear or to suffer from a harsh reaction.

Up to this point the poem deals with actions and considerations of the lover; Cynthia is only an object of them. From the middle of the poem onward the lover starts to become the person who reacts. In the next section of the middle part (1.3.27–34) the probable emotions of Cynthia begin to play a part, though the transition is gradual as her feelings are described from the point of view of the lover. The lover is horrified at every sigh of Cynthia, projecting his own original desire into them and believing that she fears that someone could act violently on her. This situation continues until the moonlight falls on Cynthia's face and wakes her.

After Cynthia has woken up, her speech follows in the poem's final part (1.3.35–46). She reacts emotionally and accuses the lover violently as she feels betrayed in her rights (cf. 1.3.37: *meae . . . noc-tis*). The period of idyllic peace is over: the lover does not have the chance to say or do anything any more. Cynthia tells him how she has spent the long period of waiting by weaving (like Penelope, cf. 2.9.3–8) and singing (like Orpheus, cf. 3.2.3–6), which can be understood as references to love by the educated reader. And particularly, her jealous assumption that the reason for the lover's late return must be another girl makes it clear to the lover and the reader that Cynthia too loves her lover. And that probably is what the poem wants to say: it is not only the lover who loves his beloved, but she also loves him. It is the first hint in the collection that the persona's love may be returned, although the love is painful for him nevertheless.

Thus, although the poet has Cynthia woken by the moonlight and thereby prevents the reader from interpreting her criticism as a reaction to the lover's disturbing her and although the lover has tried to act as cautiously as possible and has even presented Cynthia with gifts, he does not receive a warm welcome; she is angry with him. She generalizes the situation and claims that she always gets too little attention from the lover; the justification of her reproaches cannot be proved. At any rate, the reader knows that the lover loves Cynthia and that there is no reason for jealousy; thus he may consider her reproaches as unjust and sympathize with the lover. That the lover can come close to his beloved is untypical of Roman love

elegy, but at the same time his situation in elegy 1.3 is that of a typical elegiac lover, who is kept at a distance by his mistress and suffers from his love. Even near the beloved's bed the lover feels like an *exclusus amator*; he can only enjoy the sleeping Cynthia. So the lover's admission to the beloved is merely a foil for exclusion, and the scene is a portrayal of elegiac love.⁷⁴

Conclusion: the first book

The first book of Propertius is not only the first book of elegies completed by the poet in a series of a several and thus shows general characteristics of Propertius' art, but it also exhibits distinctive features of its own. Firstly, it occupies an important historical position, as by the vicissitudes of textual transmission it is the first complete book of Roman love elegy to be preserved. Secondly, in spite of this, a number of features, associated with Roman love elegy as typical characteristics, can already be found fully developed—among other things the powerful position of the *domina*, the lover in the state of *servitium amoris* and his corresponding miserableness. Thirdly, the book appears as a unified thematic whole, as it is (almost) completely centered around the persona's love to Cynthia, which is shown from different perspectives. This central idea is not interspersed with poems dealing with Propertius' poetic ideas; these rather become clear from a number of poems by implication and are directly related to the love relationship: he is determined to write love poetry provoked by his beloved and establishes a distance from other poetic genres and the political world of Rome. In addition to the thematic unity, a structural unity can be observed as the book can both be divided into several coherent parts and be read in linear progression. That the book was probably singled out among Propertius' works by later readers and booksellers is therefore not surprising.

⁷⁴ Cf. also Cairns (1977) 334–37.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE SECOND BOOK

Hans Peter Syndikus
(Translated by Dr. Christiane Brown, Bath)

Introduction

Propertius's central theme in his second as in his first book is his love of Cynthia. This restriction to a single theme distinguishes Propertius from Horace as well as from Catullus and Tibullus: In the second book no name other than Cynthia's is ever mentioned as an object of his love, and the poet frequently declares that she is incomparable and the only one for him. While he does say once that he is attracted by every kind of feminine beauty (2.22) and even that it is advisable to seek out the love of willing ladies of the night (2.23), these motifs are introduced lightly for the sake of thematic variation rather than indicating any fundamental change of heart.

In the love relationship there is no recognizable development.¹ Closeness and estrangement, love and disappointment, even withdrawal, are found side by side as they were in the first book. The eleventh elegy of the second book, for instance, reads like a final break, the twelfth describes the inescapable power of Amor; in the thirteenth Cynthia shows a unique grasp of Propertius's poetry; in the fourteenth and fifteenth the overwhelming happiness of a night of love is celebrated; while in the sixteenth we see Cynthia in the arms of a wealthy admirer etc. It is, therefore, clearly not Propertius' intention to write a history of his love relationship but to throw light on ever new and different aspects of this relationship. And in doing

¹ Sellar (1891) 299 can discover neither a chronological nor an artistic principle in the arrangement of the poems. Boucher (1965) 400–407 stresses that Propertius does not write a history of his love relationship with chronologically arranged episodes but wants to create a work of art. H. Juhnke, *Hermes* 99 (1971) 91–125 and Holzberg (1990) 41–45 try in different ways to extract groups or cycles of poems.

so he frequently draws on traditional motifs and introduces them into his contemporary world.²

In the second book he carries over the central themes of the first one but does his best to modify them with the means of his art. The poems frequently move out of the initial situation and into general observations. The motifs often do not unfold in a rational development of ideas but follow the vacillations of the emotions. The often quite complicated structure of the poems irritates many a reader who expects the depiction of a situation to present a unified whole. It is, however, precisely this loose structure that characterizes a number of the elegies of the second book and distinguishes them from the simpler compositions of the first book.³

Because of this peculiar nature of the poems, the transmitted text has caused surprise and dismay even since Scaliger. Attempts were made to achieve a more 'sensible' text by subdividing the poems differently, by rearranging the lines, or by accepting copious interpolations. Some of these suggestions were ingenious, indeed. Behind these attempts at reconstruction, however, often lay the changing conceptions of the correct shape of a well-constructed poem, which are, after all, based on more or less period-specific standards. Since none of these attempts have led to a generally accepted result, I shall try to understand the poems without frequent line rearrangements and interpolations while, of course, pointing out the difficulties presented by the transmission of the text in the division of the poems and other matters. My interpretations are based on Fedeli's text; any deviation will be indicated in the notes.

First elegy

In the opening poem of the second book Propertius essentially defends his own individual way of composing poetry before Maecenas, into

² Williams (1968) 561 sees the poetic world of the Roman elegiac poets as a combination of traditional elements and personal experience. The traditional poetic forms were also revitalized by the poets' imagination and experience. Veyne (1983) goes decidedly too far in his view that Cynthia and Tibullus's Delia were purely poetic inventions (p. 69) and the Roman love elegy a mere montage of quotations (p. 12). Newman (1997) 28, too, regards the character of Cynthia more as a literary construct than a real live woman. But see G. Lieberg in Radke (1998) 207f.

³ See La Penna (1977) 53.

whose circle he had been admitted after the success of the first book of elegies.⁴ Propertius appears to assume that Maecenas would have preferred a broader spectrum of themes and, above all, an epic praising the Augustan present.⁵ He uses a motif from Virgil's sixth eclogue. Following the prologue to the *Aetia* by Callimachus, Virgil had said there that Apollo, the god of poetry, himself had exhorted him not to write a grand epic but to choose a small form and a simple style.⁶ Callimachus' blunt rejection of the traditional epic that Catullus had still taken over in his ninety-fifth poem is no longer contained in Virgil's eclogue: he simply refers to others who are at home with this poetic form. Similarly, Propertius, without criticizing the epic as such, points out his idiosyncrasy and above all his inability of mastering this elevated form. In his support he quotes Callimachus in line 39f.: due to a kind of poetic talent similar to his own, the Greek poet too had been unable to compose an epic poem.

The poet expands this central idea of lines 17–42 in a variety of ways. Even before he comes to mention his own modest talent he explains in lines 1–16 that his one and only source of inspiration is his beloved Cynthia, with whom the readers of the first book are already familiar. He does not yet speak to Maecenas here, but addresses his friends and readers in general.⁷ Diplomatically he suggests to the general public rather than to Maecenas that they may be surprised that love is his only topic and that he writes nothing but love poems (*mollis liber*). In response he says that his poetry is inspired only by the beloved whose extraordinary attraction he describes in lines 5ff. He mentions her radiant appearance, her proud gait, the play of the curls on her brow, her musical gifts and finally her erotic allure. All this, he explains, is the inexhaustible topic of his poetry. In tune with the subsequent poetic context he sums up this idea playfully with the words: this is the material for his *Iliads* and his historical epic (lines 14–16). Propertius makes it absolutely clear, therefore, before he starts on his main theme, that a poet for

⁴ This is shown by the type of address in line 73f. and the expected friendly words in line 77f. See Boucher (1965) 37; Álvarez Hernández (1997) 90f.

⁵ Such a wish is mentioned in 3.9,3. See also 3.9,52; Verg. *G.* 3.41.

⁶ Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3–12. The model is Call. fr. 1.21–24 Pf. See Wimmel (1960) 37–39; La Penna (1977) 218f.; Álvarez Hernández (1997) 104ff.

⁷ Beginnings with *quaeris*, *quaeritis* occur frequently. They are used to create a poetic context: 1.22; 2.31; 3.13; see Abel (1930) 31–37. In line 5 the *vidi* of the *deteriores* is a convincing reading; see Enk 15.

whom love is the only inspiration cannot be expected to compose a solemn poem in an elevated style.

Even after addressing Maecenas himself, however, in line 17 Propertius still puts off the crucial statement that he is unable to compose an Augustan epic and simply expresses his goodwill in two hypothetical sentences: If it were in his power he would much prefer to praise Augustus and his loyal supporter Maecenas. As his topic he would choose the great deeds of Augustus rather than the old legends about gods and heroes or stories from Greek and Roman history. In this context he mentions (lines 27–30) not only, as was usual, the decisive victory of Actium that had made Augustus the ruler of the world; but he also names in loose order⁸ his victory of Mutina, the one over Caesar's murderers, over Sextus Pompeius and the rebels at Perugia; finally reaches Augustus' conquest of Egypt; and celebrates the subsequent triumph.⁹ This recapitulation of all the stages in Augustus's rise to power—which was after all, frequently very bloody—has been interpreted as a critique of this political route.¹⁰ But considering the context that celebrates Maecenas's contribution to these events, such an intention would be most peculiar indeed. It is more likely that the events before Actium are mentioned because Maecenas played a more important part in them than in the final stages of the war in which he probably did not take part. But the main point seems to be Propertius's intention to show, by naming such a profusion of historical events, that it was impossible for him, at least, to give poetic shape to this material.

⁸ Boucher (1965) 369–71 shows that Propertius is here as little interested in chronological correctness as he is elsewhere when he lists historical events; he clearly deliberately avoids the strictly historical.

⁹ In line 37f. a mythological comparison of the friendship and mutual loyalty between Augustus and Maecenas appear to be intended; see Camps ad 37–38. However, the expression is so cryptic that it may be fair to assume a corruption, or—as in Günther (199a7) 17 n. 50—a gap in the text.

¹⁰ See Sullivan (1976) 57f.; Stahl (1985) 164f. While turns of phrase like *civilia busta* (27) or *eversos focos* (28) show that Propertius, like his contemporaries, had suffered under the ravages of the civil war, he does not question the result in any way, however much he may prefer values other than those officially admired. The first Roman elegiac poet Gallus supported Caesar and Augustus even more unreservedly, having risen under them to the highest military and civil ranks. (His subsequent fall from grace has nothing to do with literature.) Gallus's attitude is reflected in the papyrus from Quasr Ibrīm, lines 2–5 and in the inscription Dessau 8995. Gallus's and Propertius's views on Augustan politics are explained by G. Lieberg in Radke (1998) 202f.

In lines 39–46 Propertius concludes his excuses and states his actual topic: Just as Callimachus had not been able to write epic poems about the battles of the gods he, Propertius, is incapable of composing a high epic that—as Virgil was to do in the *Aeneid*—praises Augustus through his Trojan ancestors. And then, as if intent on gliding over his refusal quickly, he concludes lightly: People tend to talk about their preoccupations, and his was, after all, love.¹¹ There is no need for him to be more explicit, having already depicted his enchantment with it in the first sixteen lines. Line 46 finally provides a closing punchline with the proverbial phrase¹² that everybody should spend his time doing things he understands.

With these lines the topic of his defense both of his way of life and his manner of composing poetry might appear concluded. Ribbeck, for instance, has cut off the following text at this point. On the other hand, every reader of the first book knew that what had been said so far did not do justice to the true nature of Propertius' love. It was, after all, by no means one of unalloyed happiness. It is true that Cynthia was able to attract him over and over again and give him great happiness, but her inconstancy could also thrust him into deepest despair. This is why Propertius finds it necessary to portray the characteristics of his love more precisely. Central to this depiction is the fact that he is not looking for a series of love affairs, as a friend had suggested he ought to in *Elegy* 1.4. What he wants is to maintain his love for Cynthia unswervingly throughout the rest of his life.¹³

Line 47 begins in a general vein with the statement that a love that lasts until death is praiseworthy. When the poet then continues that a single love would add a further claim to fame, he changes the certainty of his statement. The words *si datur* and *posse* contain an unmissable reference to the fragility of such happiness. It does, after all, depend not only on one's own willingness but also on that of the partner.¹⁴ So it is that the lover must hope that he alone is

¹¹ In verse 45 Volscus' textual suggestion *versamus* is a convincing amendment.

¹² See Otto (1890) s.v. *ars* No 1; Enk ad 46.

¹³ As also in *Cat.* 109,5f. This was already a central motif of the first book: 1.4.3f.; 1.8.43–46; 1.12.19f. Then: 2.6.41f.; 2.13.36; 2.15.31–36; 2.24.33f.; 2.25.9f.; 2.28.42; 2.30.23f. Finally in 2.34.93f. Propertius describes Cynthia as the beloved of his poetry. See Boucher (1965) 85–90; Burck (1966a) 195; Williams (1968) 484–87.

¹⁴ See on the interpretation: R. Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 31 (1886) 187; Shackleton Bailey (1956) 62.

blessed with the happiness of this person's love and no strange interloper comes between the lovers. He thinks he can remember that the beloved does not approve of waywardness in love, but how much he can rely on such a statement is a big question; the words *si memini* clearly show an uncertainty.

In the stylistically elevated section following line 51 the poet again expresses his hope for a lifelong love. Even love potions and the power of magic of which ancient legends talk would not be able to deflect him from his love. He would remain steadfast (lines 51–56). Since one woman had captivated all his senses, his funeral procession would set off from her house one day. In further examples he demonstrates that there are cures for every human ailment except love (lines 57–64). This juxtaposition of severe diseases and injuries with love clearly shows that he does not regard love as carefree bliss but also as a tormenting passion. It was in the same way that Propertius had already described it in the first book of his elegies.¹⁵ In a third section (lines 65–70) the poet even declares that whoever could deliver him from this passion (*vitium*)¹⁶ would also be able to free Prometheus and all the tortured souls in the underworld from their suffering.

In the last distiches following line 71 Propertius returns to Maecenas. He imagines that he will die soon,¹⁷ due to the suffering inflicted on him by his pain-filled love life, and Maecenas will one day in passing stop at his graveside. Propertius asks him to remember him with some kind words of regret, namely that a mistress with too hard a heart had been this poor man's fate.¹⁸ With these final words the love that Propertius sees as his inescapable fate takes on an almost tragic character, and Maecenas is given the words of a kind friend who is sympathetic to this fate. By expecting Maecenas to utter such words in the spirit of friendship, Propertius divests himself of the

¹⁵ See 1.1.26.35; 1.5.3–6; 1.7.5–8; 1.9.19–24; 1.15.1f. Cat. 76.25 and Tib. 2.5.109f., too, can see love as a disease. In verse 58 Tränkle (1960) 23.2 defends the transmitted text.

¹⁶ *Vitium* is used to describe passionate love also in 2.22.17f. and 3.17.6. See Enk ad 45.

¹⁷ The motif is varied in 1.7.13 where the poet envisages the lovers of Rome standing admiringly at his grave. Here it is prepared by the thoughts of death expressed in lines 47 and 56 and the images of the underworld in lines 65–67.

¹⁸ Even in 1.1.1 he described himself as *miser* in his love relationship and Cynthia in 1.7.6 as *dura domina*.

need to make any more excuses for being incapable of writing a great epic poem.¹⁹

Second elegy

In his elegy *ca.* 68 Catullus had called his beloved a radiant goddess when she visited him for the first time; he had celebrated her appearance as the epiphany of a goddess of love and compared her love to that of Laodamia, one of the great lovers of Greek legend.²⁰ In Propertius's poetry the raising of the beloved to mythical heights is one of the most striking characteristics. As if put under a magic spell by her sight he had compared her to Greek heroines in Elegy 1.3, and in Elegy 1.19.7–10 he had, like Catullus, alluded to the love of Laodamia and Protesilaus. This second elegy now serves in its entirety to celebrate Cynthia as a vision from the exalted world of Greek goddesses and heroines.

Propertius begins by describing how he had irresistibly succumbed to Cynthia's charms. Briefly he had believed himself free and able to live his own life, but Cynthia's beauty had quickly drawn him back under her spell. In line 3 he is amazed that such beauty exists in our everyday world. So his thoughts take him into the world of the Greek myths, which alone seems to be able to furnish him with adequate images for his experience of beauty. He can now sympathize with the father of the gods, who in ancient times had descended to so many beauties on earth. Cynthia appears to him like one of those figures attracting the greatest of the gods. When he describes the way she walks in lines 6–8 with the gait of the great goddesses like Hera and Athene he conjures up the majestic images of goddesses that could be seen in the temples and public places in Rome. Especially reminiscent of these sculptures is the image of Athene with the Gorgon head on her breast.

In lines 9–11 the mythological comparisons become more selective. Isomache being snatched away and the love union of Hermes and

¹⁹ Propertius varies the central juxtaposition of the poem in 3.4 and 3.5. In 3.4 he acknowledges the great deeds of Augustus without expressing any criticism. Then in 3.5 he contrasts them with his own different choice of life and poetry. In the first verses of these poems *arma* and *pax* are the two antithetically placed key words. The final line 3.4.22 marks the transition from one topic to the next.

²⁰ See Lieberg (1962), especially 189–93; Syndikus (2001) 272–80.

Brimo on the shore of a Thessalian lake must go back to pieces of poetry now lost to us. But the profusion of Greek names has also been chosen for the sake of their sound. We should not, therefore, ask too many questions about why Pallas Athene walks *Dulichias* . . . *ad aras*, why the name of the Lapithaeon beauty snatched away by the centaurs is *Isomache*, and why the divine couple are united in love at *Boebeidos undis*.²¹ The Greek words with their unfamiliar and enticing sound are meant to convey the magic aura of a more elevated poetic world. The three naked goddesses on Mount Ida finally conjure up the artistic depiction of the judgment of Paris as it is shown in the Pompeian wall frescos. The final distich, on the other hand, expressing the fear that age may destroy Cynthia's beauty one day, jolts us out of the magical realm of the imagination and takes us back into the reality of the here and now. It also links the end of the poem with its beginning in expressing the poet's amazement that such unearthly beauty can exist on this earth.

Third elegy, lines 1–44

This elegy is the third poem in the second Book that celebrates Cynthia's beauty. The first lines begin with a fictitious dialogue. A friend reminds Propertius that he had claimed he could live without love, but after only a short while things were the same as before, and already a second book of poetry was filling up with his frivolous topics. In lines 4–8 Propertius answers that he had tried to do the impossible²² and attempted to pursue serious occupations. Love had, however, gotten the better of him.²³

The reason he gives in the following lines is Cynthia's sheer irresistibility. In a lengthy section (lines 9–22) he explains that it is not so much her beauty that attracts him (although that is breathtaking) as her musical and artistic gifts. He celebrates her beauty in the third elegy as he had done in the first and second elegy, but

²¹ The text in line 11 with Camps and Fedeli: *Mercurio aut qualis*.

²² This statement occurs in the form of the so-called adynata. Ever since Archilochus this had been used to describe something impossible, for instance by Virgil, *Ecl.* 1.59f.

²³ Lines 1–8 are seen as a soliloquy by Rothstein, but the juxtaposition of an almost incredulous reproach with a following explanation is better suited to a dialogue. See Abel (1930) 43f.

her dancing, her playing of the lyre, and her poetic talent are now more important to him.²⁴ Her beauty is brought to life through comparisons with nature, her gifts and accomplishments with the help of the Greek myths and the world of Greek poetry. The Dionysian choruses led by Ariadne, Sappho's plectron, the lyres of the muses, and the poetry of Corinna show Cynthia well versed in Greek culture. This is no mere flattery. This was the time when emancipated female figures emerged who, through their education and culture as well as also their luxurious and totally uninhibited lifestyle, had thoroughly emancipated themselves from earlier notions of Roman womanhood.²⁵

In the next part, lines 23–32, Cynthia is addressed in words of almost hymnic adoration and is raised again close to the realm of the immortals in tones of rapturous exaltation. We are told God Amor had sneezed at her birth, which was generally considered a sign of good luck,²⁶ and the immortals had showered her with their gifts. The poet's claim that this is irreconcilable with a normal human birth implies that she is in fact of divine nature. He then finally leaves the mortal sphere altogether when he sees her in a fantasy vision as the first Roman woman certain to become the beloved of Zeus himself like the heroines of ancient days.²⁷ In a further comparison Cynthia appears as a second Helena. In view of such beauty the poet can understand why the Trojan War had broken out. All in all, beauty like Cynthia's appears as the greatest treasure of the world and every sacrifice for its sake as justified.²⁸ Propertius links

²⁴ Propertius had treated this aspect already in 1.2.27–30. Meleager, too, in *A.P.* 5.139 and 140 is enchanted by a girl's singing and playing of the harp, but in this case it is more a matter of the usual accomplishments of a hetaera; see also Álvarez Hernández (1997) 37. Johnson, *CJ* 41 (1945–46) 20–23 explains line 22 as litotes: "Poems that everyone (scil. every poet) considers unequal to his own" means "better than his own"; see Enk ad 22.

²⁵ A key text to this is Sallust, *Cat.* 25. The new type of woman is characterized by Lyne (1980) 8–18. La Penna (1977) 28.210 and G. Lieberg in Radke (1998) 204f. count Cynthia among these.

²⁶ See Hom. *Od.* 17.541f.; Theocr. 7.96; *Cat.* 45.8f., 17f.

²⁷ 1.13.32 and Petron. 126.18 also play with this topic. Otherwise there is a common motif in erotic literature that a woman would not even prefer the love of Zeus to that of her lover: *Cat.* 70.2; 72.2; Ov. *Met.* 7.801. Related is also the idea that Zeus might snatch away a beautiful boy as he once did with Ganymed: *A.P.* 12.65 and 70 (Meleagros).

²⁸ In lines 37–40 Propertius takes the motif from Hom. *Il.* 3.156–158 and exaggerates it.

the beauty of the beloved once more in a somewhat different way, with the ideal of beauty in Greek art, when he suggests in conclusion that every painter hoping to excel his great ancient predecessors should paint Cynthia in order to be admired both in East and West.

Third elegy, lines 45–54 and fourth elegy

In accordance with the Aldina of 1502 Schrader, Lachmann and Enk²⁹ separate lines 45–54 from the third elegy and begin the next poem with them. This decision is well-founded. Line 43f. rounds off the elegy very effectively, while the topic of the next poem, a lament about the disappointments and hardships of passionate love, sets in equally emphatically in line 44. The language of lines 45ff. also changes fundamentally. Instead of the almost hymnic tone of adulation of the third elegy, the following section varies a good deal in tone. The poet constantly changes between confession and generalization. In the first distich the poet talks about himself; line 3.49f. refers to lovers in general (*iuvenes*) after an animal comparison; following a mythological comparison the poet then addresses a second person (lines 4.1–4) while also speaking to an ordinary lover. In line 4.5 Propertius returns to his own experiences. General statements and personal experiences continue to alternate in the same way, to the end of the poem.

The beginning, if it is the beginning, of the new poem, focuses immediately on the new topic: Considering the poet wishes ardently in 3.45 to be sustained by his one love,³⁰ since a second one would kill him, the nature of this first love appears quite alarming enough.³¹ The way to endure a love of this kind, nevertheless, is shown in the next lines. As a comparison the poet uses a bull, which first struggles against the yoke that is placed on him but in the end gets used to it and puts up with the burden willingly.³² In the same way, young

²⁹ Schrader (1776) 119; Enk, *Studi in onore G. Funaioli* (Roma 1955) 32–36 and the same (1962) 72f.

³⁰ In 3.45 *finibus* is defined by the following *alter amor* as *finibus primi amoris*.

³¹ The second sentence in line 45 begins with the exclamation *ei* on which everything depends. The transmitted reading *aut* does not make any sense in this sentence. In line 3.46 *acrius ut moriar* clearly belong together. See Shackleton Bailey (1956) 67.

³² Leo (1912) 155 pursues this motif which is widely used in erotic literature.

men who first resisted eventually submitted to all kinds of hardship once they had surrendered (literally: when they have been tamed). Then an example from mythology demonstrates what can be borne for the sake of love. In order to win the beautiful Pero, Melampus had submitted to wearing ignominious chains for a whole year.³³ Similarly, lovers in Rome had to suffer periods of bondage: they had to lament the infidelity of their mistresses and patiently tolerate their rejections and anger (lines 4.1–4).³⁴ He, Propertius, too, had frequently tried in vain to please his beloved (line 4.5f.).

As far as line 4.6, the happy end of the Melampus story and the *prius* pointing to a likely success in line 4.1 had implied that the suffering borne by a lover might eventually lead to success after all. In the following section, in lines 4.7–16, however, the passion of love comes to appear as an ever more hopeless endeavor. Neither medicine nor magic potion are of avail. Other than in the case of common illnesses that have detectable causes and cures that can be prescribed by doctors, one is left groping in the dark where the sickness of love is concerned. A cure is impossible. Propertius mentions that he spends a lot of money in vain on fortunetellers and interpreters of dreams in a futile attempt to find a way out of the confusion caused by his passion.³⁵ Worst of all, this disease can be fatal.

Following the three poems in a light mood at the beginning of the book Propertius proceeds to draw love in the darkest hues in the fourth elegy having already in the first book explored the extremes of love scaling the greatest heights of happiness and plumbing the fathomless depths of despair. The advice in the last three distiches to seek out the problem-free love of boys instead of indulging in such fatal passions comes as a complete surprise, although it does fit in with his characterization of passionate love. For someone who

³³ In line 3.53 *Pero formosa coegit* implies that Propertius took the story to mean that Melampus wanted to win Pero for himself as Hom. *Od.* 11.289 also suggests. In Hom. *Od.* 15.225 and Apollod. 1.9,12, on the other hand, Melampus wants to win Pero for his brother.

³⁴ Thematically comparable is 1.5.11–22. The fact that *dubio pede* in 2.4.4 is not consistent with the loud and angry stamping of the foot is shown by Shackleton Bailey (1956) 68. Concerning line 4.5f. he makes an apt comparison with Tib. 1.8.8f.

³⁵ Line 4.15f. can be understood in context with line 14: His observation on the obliqueness of the paths of love is followed by unsuccessful attempts at exploring them. The newer editors usually accept Birt's transposition of the distich after line 8.

adores women as Propertius does, this piece of advice must have been prompted by despair.³⁶

Fifth elegy

The poem represents an attempt to cut himself loose from his relationship with Cynthia because of her thoroughly licentious way of life. But the angry outburst does not last. Propertius cannot break with the woman he loves so fervently and finally turns back to her again, entreating and imploring her. This kind of reversal from angry disappointment to meek submission has an early model in comedy. In Plautus's *Truculentus*, lines 758–769, a lover who has been shut out rails angrily against a hetaera and threatens her with revenge. Then he realizes that he lacks the strength to leave her, and with this his anger subsides. A disappointed lover making a similarly futile attempt to free himself is also presented by Terence in the first scene of *Eunuchus*.³⁷

In the first part of the poem, in lines 1–8, the poet addresses the beloved indignantly as if he just could not believe what he has heard about her way of life. Of course, he knows that it is the truth and asks, grief-stricken, whether his love deserves this. He immediately makes the decision: to find another girl³⁸ who does not torment him as Cynthia does, and who is pleased if she becomes famous through his verses. This break with her is intended as the poet's revenge, and he imagines how she will feel remorse once it is too late and shed bitter tears about her infidelity.³⁹ This expectation alone, however, demonstrates the weak position of a man who is still in love; since he is counting on Cynthia to experience this pain, he is also expecting her basically still to love him. And if she does, how can he leave her then?

In the middle part of the poem, in lines 9–16, Propertius tries to bolster his decision by talking to himself. This kind of coaxing directed

³⁶ See Enk ad 18 after Vulpius. In line 20 Giardina's suggestion *gurgitis* instead of the corrupt *litoris* is worth considering; see Ov. *Met.* 5.469; 14.51.

³⁷ This motif can also be found in *A.P.* 5.24; 5.184 (Meleager) and in Cat. 8. See Day (1938) 87f.

³⁸ This is a common way for unhappy lovers in erotic poetry to console themselves: Theocr. 11.76; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.73; Hor. *Epo.* 15.14.

³⁹ Tib. 1.9,79f., too, knows this threat and the remorse when it is too late.

to a basically unwilling self also occurs in Catullus's eight poem. But while Catullus merely describes the vacillations of the emotions, the more reflective Propertius understands very well what is going on in his heart. He is aware of the power of love and knows how easily he might weaken and relapse. So he wants to make use of the anger he is feeling at the moment, to put his decision into practice, and tries to convince himself with sensible arguments that it is possible to survive a separation, however much it hurts to begin with.

Interrupting his own thoughts, the poet abruptly turns again to Cynthia in line 17. His resolute determination to turn his back on her is broken. He no longer addresses her as the unfaithful one, as he had done in line 3, but with an endearment as his life. Reminding her of her erstwhile oaths of love he implores her not so much to be faithful to him again but, like a concerned friend, not to harm herself by her way of life. Then he takes up once more his threat to fight back from line 3, but the motif has changed completely. Even the comparison with a helpless sheep makes the weakness of his own position more than obvious;⁴⁰ there is no more talk of finding a new lover, and as if shocked by his own words Propertius goes through a list of things other disappointed lovers might do but he as a poet would never stoop to. He would certainly never force open her door, tear up her clothes, dishevel her hair or even hit her.⁴¹ He will do nothing but write a single line: Cynthia's beauty is powerful, but promises she does not keep. Having insisted that this line will tarnish her character forever, he then immediately adds that Cynthia usually does not care about her reputation. So one is left to wonder, especially considering the lampoons composed by Archilochus and Catullus, whether this harmless line has the slightest chance of hurting Cynthia or whether it does not indicate instead the barely disguised collapse of his attempted rebellion.⁴²

⁴⁰ Horace, on the other hand, chooses the image that Propertius rejects in line 19: in *Epo.* 6.11f. he wants to turn into a wild bull.

⁴¹ Propertius is not normally so faint-hearted: 2.15.17–20; see also 3.8.1–10. Tib. 1.10.57–67 does not reject this treatment either as being part and parcel of a passionate relationship, although he draws the line at beatings.

⁴² Burck (1966a) 234f. does however think that verses of this pointed severity definitely posed a threat within a society in which reputations mattered so much.

Sixth elegy

Similar in form to elegy 1.3 this poem begins with a triple comparison *non ita, nec tanta, nec tam multis*. In the earlier elegy Propertius had compared the sleeping Cynthia to the beauties of Greek mythology. Now he compares the hordes of her admirers to the hordes that once swarmed around the most famous hetaeras in ancient Corinth and Athens. This appears to be a somewhat strange complement. While the comparisons underline Cynthia's beauty they do not exactly give her a good character.

These comparisons should, on the other hand, probably be seen in relation to what follows.⁴³ In lines 7–14 Propertius shows himself in the grip of an almost pathological jealousy. Changing nervously between present and future tense he enumerates all the things that arouse his jealousy: Relatives kissing Cynthia when greeting her he always suspects of being secret lovers. Mere pictures and names of young men kindle his suspicions, even children. He does not want her own mother to kiss her, or her sister or a girlfriend to sleep close to her. Again a chain of repetitions underlines his state of agitation: *me laedunt—me—me laedet—me laedent*. In the context of this agitated emotional state the comparisons at the beginning of the poem also come to appear like pictures painted by jealousy.

He also deliberately exaggerates the statements he makes in the subsequent lines. His threatening claims that such passions⁴⁴ had caused wars in the past, brought about the fall of Troy and the battle between the Lapithae and the Centaurs, appear hardly apposite to his private situation. These comparisons don't seem to fit in at all. The disasters in the old myths were after all caused mainly by the uncontrolled passions of the men, and only in Helen's case also by a woman being seduced too easily.

These broader comparisons have in fact moved the poem away from the actual situation of the two lovers. In the following the poet paints a picture of the general licentiousness in the Rome of his time as background to Cynthia's conduct. The transition is made possible by the figure of Romulus, the founder of the city who gave the orders for the rape of the Sabines (lines 19–22). This brutal act

⁴³ See Boucher (1965) 446f.

⁴⁴ On *vitium* in this meaning, see Pichon (1991) s.v. *vitium* Nr. 1.

appears still to be seen in parallel with the acts committed by Paris as well as the Centaurs, i.e., as an image of male brutality and lawlessness. When he then says that the pursuit of the ecstasies of love following the example of Romulus was crossing all moral boundaries in Rome, the poet deliberately leaves the nature of the pursuit vague to cover misdemeanours of every kind;⁴⁵ the women may also be included among the perpetrators. It is on them alone he focuses in the following depiction of the Roman situation.

With the two examples demonstrating the opposite, the two faithful wives Alcestis and Penelope, in line 23f. he throws a final brief glance at mythical Greece before concentrating entirely on the conditions in Rome. He begins by stating categorically in line 25f. that having a temple dedicated to Pudicitia, the goddess of female modesty, had become meaningless for the girls of Rome since even the married women did not observe any moral boundaries anymore. He adds in lines 27–34 that the girls are surrounded by seductive erotic images in their houses from early on in their youth and curses those who have invented this art.⁴⁶ In his anger the poet slips into an altogether alien mask. He adopts a thoroughly moralistic and judgmental tone reminiscent of Horace's critique of Roman marriage morals in Ode 3.6. This is also where the look back to better times and the reference to the neglect and decay of the temples are to be found, occurring here in Propertius's lines 33–36.⁴⁷ The counter images to the immoral present contained in Horace's Ode and in Propertius elegies do, of course, differ from each other: While Horace saw his ideal in the hard working youth of ancient Rome, Propertius finds it in the mythical world of faithful lovers instead.⁴⁸

After this excursion into general topics Propertius returns to Cynthia in lines 37–42. It now dawns on him how pointless it is to follow her or spy on her suspiciously. He acknowledges that a woman's only protection is her own moral sense. Whatever happened, he

⁴⁵ The *quidlibet* in line 22 is picked up by the *quidlibet* in line 26, which now refers to the women.

⁴⁶ On the text in 31f., *in terris turpia*, see Shackleton Bailey (1956) 72f. Leo (1912) 151–54 examines the extensive tradition containing this curse for the inventor. The poet's disapproval of the erotic themes depicted in frescos is, however, anything but serious. It is this aspect of Greek mythology that Propertius particularly enjoys; see, for instance 2.30.27–30.

⁴⁷ R. Reitzenstein in *Hermes* 31 (1896) 220 refers to the similarity of the motifs.

⁴⁸ An image of this kind appears in 3.13.25–46.

would not be deterred from his fidelity. For him Cynthia would remain the one and only beloved.⁴⁹ With these reflections the poem has become calmer. The storm of jealousy with which it had begun has ebbed away.

Seventh elegy

Among a number of laws introduced after the end of the civil war by the victorious Octavian, in an effort to stabilize the situation, there was also one that was intended to revive the morality in marriage and family relations customary in ancient Rome. When this law caused resentment in the totally changed society he withdrew the law, without, however, abandoning his intention forever.⁵⁰ Propertius' words and the marriage laws enacted in the years 18 BC and 9 AD give us an indication of what the earlier law might have looked like. What appears to have been Propertius' problem was this: on the one hand, he could not marry Cynthia because of her notorious way of life, on the other, he would have been financially penalized as a bachelor.

The poem was composed after the retraction of the law. While line 1 clearly addresses Cynthia, the *certe* in his words "I am sure, you must have been pleased" sounds somewhat remote. So it does not come as a surprise when he talks of her in the third person in line 15. After the brief personal beginning the poem turns into a discussion of the principles of the Augustan moral legislation. In the introductory poem of the second book Propertius had described his attitude to the Augustan rule. While accepting it, he had declared, he is unable to contribute to it being a poet of love and of the small form; what he wanted is to be left to himself, as it were, to sacrifice

⁴⁹ In similarly pointed endings to poems Propertius protests his unwavering love again and again: 1.12.19f.; 1.19.25f.; 2.6.41f.; 2.7.19; 2.20.34–36; 2.21.19f. The different possibilities of ending a poem are treated by Lefèvre (1966) 131–51.

⁵⁰ Our poem provides the only documentation for the first legislation, probably in 28 BC, and its retraction. Sueton, Aug. 34, knows that Augustus withdrew morality laws and then reintroduced them in a new form, but whether he includes the law of the year 28 is uncertain, because he makes no clear distinction between the different laws. On morality legislation, see Kienast (1982) 137f. M. Beck, *Philologus* 144 (2000) 303–24, doubts the existence of this law altogether because of the paucity of evidence and believes the poem to be a post-Propertian invention. The arguments for depriving a major poem of its recognition would have to be more convincing.

to his own gods in a quiet corner. In this way he had made a clear distinction between the public world and his private sphere of life. Now he had to realize that the world of politics wanted to interfere in his private life, too. And in our elegy he does not try to conceal how indignant he is about this interference. With clarity and courage he puts the emperor in his place: in matters of love the state had no power, not even Jupiter could separate lovers. And he would rather die than betray his love to Cynthia and enter into a marriage.⁵¹ Almost pathetically he adds that he is incapable of begetting soldiers for future patriotic wars. No soldiers would grow from his seed.

After thus rejecting the demands of politics he professes his love without reserve in lines 15–20. In line 15 he introduces a variation on the motif of war service in the sense of erotic poetry that often compared the tribulations caused by a love affair with those of a soldier's life.⁵² When he claims he would be happy to follow his beloved as a soldier, no charger would be too fiery for him, the image suggests that the troubles and battles of love are his reality, his *vera castra*, not those of the actual Roman world. He had already described this contrast in a similar vein in elegy 1.6.29f., declaring he was not made for fame and weapons and his war service was rendered in the service of love.⁵³ From this war service he has gained fame reaching to the end of the earth,⁵⁴ he continues, and concludes this elegy like the previous one with a declaration of love to Cynthia, who is the only one he loves and by whom he wants to be loved and whose love he rates more highly than the name father.

Eighth elegy

The beginning of the next elegy expresses the exact opposite. Propertius draws a picture of boundless despair because Cynthia has abandoned him. His passionate emotions now surge, then ebb away again.

⁵¹ In line 8 *amore* is the obvious reading. The claim for exclusivity in Propertius' concept of love (2.6.41f.) would be irreconcilable with marriage to another, as it would mean the dividing up of the partnership; see Enk ad 8; Stahl (1985) 145. For a different view, see Shackleton Bailey (1956) 74 and Giardina 140.

⁵² See Camps ad 15.

⁵³ Similarly Tib. 1.1.75; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.44; see also Prop. 4.1.135–138: *haec tua castra*.

⁵⁴ That his fame came from his love poetry he has already said in 1.7.9f. On the poetic motif see Hor. *C.* 2.20.14–16; on the relations of *hinc*, see Enk ad 17.

In lines 1–6 he addresses a friend who wanted to distract him, but nothing can comfort him: The woman he loves so passionately has been taken from him and now lies in the arms of another man. No hatred could exceed the hatred he bears the happy rival; even someone who wanted to murder him would be less hateful to him.

In the following he loses sight of the friend altogether; the poem becomes a soliloquy. Its character changes all the time.⁵⁵ To begin with, in lines 7–10, Propertius seems to accept his fate. He seeks refuge in an old saying that ‘everything moves on, everything changes’.⁵⁶ Love, he says, is just like the proverbial wheel of fortune:⁵⁷ Triumph is followed by the descent into the abyss. In the comparisons which follow he moves into strange territory when he goes so far as to claim that this was how great military leaders and kings, and great cities like Thebes and Troy, had come to grief. This hyperbole is not unusual for Propertius, of course. He likes to give his fate a dimension of greatness, and here he wants to make his unspeakable pain felt. Catullus had done something similar before him when in the fifty-first poem he compared his ruin with that of great kings and cities. At the same time these comparisons open up the way into the mythical sphere he is about to enter.

The attempt to draw comfort does not last. In line 11f. the poet remembers how all his demonstrations of love and devotion were never properly reciprocated. In lines 13–16 he speaks to the unfaithful Cynthia as if she were present. All the humiliations he has suffered in the blindness of his love come flooding into his mind. He was treated like a slave, and, he asks himself, will he have to continue to suffer her abuse.

In line 17 he sinks back, spent and exhausted. Like the desperate Catullus in his eighth poem he addresses himself by his name. Resigned to his fate he believes death is the only thing left to him. Despite everything he has suffered at Cynthia’s hands he cannot imagine life without her. Having called to himself in desperation “Then die”, he adds sarcastically, that if he were to end like this it would only give pleasure to his hard-hearted mistress who might then pour scorn over his grave. His decision to die then conjures

⁵⁵ See Rothstein 257; La Penna (1977) 55f.; Warden (1980) 92–94; Lyne (1980) 124f.

⁵⁶ See Otto (1890) s.v. *omnis* No 5.

⁵⁷ See *OLD* s.v. *rota* No 3 d.

up another image from mythology, that of Haemon who couldn't imagine life without Antigone⁵⁸ and therefore killed himself. Propertius appears to be considering suicide rather than merely a slow death from the torments of his unrequited love. But while he is making this mythological comparison he comes to realize that there were two deaths in the old myth, and in a wild murder fantasy he determines that Cynthia to whom he is speaking again agitatedly will die with him. His dagger must drip with the blood of both of them. Knowing full well that the murder of his mistress will dishonor him, he will still do it.

In line 31 a third mythological comparison is introduced. The poet appears to have realized how excessive his murder fantasy was. So he looks around in the world of legends for an example of a passion with similarly dreadful consequences.⁵⁹ He remembers the Achilles of the Iliad who caused the slaughter of the Greek army, even left his best friend to the mercy of death, because of his grief when Briseis was taken from him. Having followed the ensuing action of the Iliad in line 37f. and described how Achilles had returned to reason after Briseis had been handed back to him, Propertius too seems to be able to consider his situation more calmly. In the final distich he soberly remarks that it was small wonder he had been driven to such extreme emotions by his love, considering even the son of a god like Achilles had been driven to act as he did.

Ninth elegy

Propertius here modifies motifs present in the fifteenth elegy of the first book.⁶⁰ Even then he had confronted his beloved with her infidelity and referred to examples of faithful women from Greek mythology—which, however, could not induce her to follow their example. Nevertheless, he then swore solemnly he would never give up his love, however badly Cynthia chose to treat him.

⁵⁸ Line 24 shows that this is the point of comparison with the mythological example; Enk ad 21.

⁵⁹ U. Knoche, *Gnomon* 12 (1936) 267f., sees three motives as points of comparison: the beloved being taken from him, the pain suffered on account of it, and being driven to extreme actions.

⁶⁰ Lyne (1980) 96 points out the relationship between the motifs.

The treatment of the same theme in the second book differs considerably in the details. The mythological examples are more concentrated. There are only two instead of four, but the fidelity of these women is described vividly in full and detailed images.⁶¹ The situation has become more intense. Earlier Cynthia had shown her frivolity and disloyalty by lacking concern when he was ill, dressing and making up carefully as if in search of a new lover. Now Cynthia has taken up with another man because she is upset about her lover's brief absence. Propertius calls her *impia* and *perfidia* and mocks her for not being able to stand a single night without a lover and for pursuing a man who had previously left her (line 23f.). Then he pictures the scene, imagining how the two of them had sat together over their wine, making fun of him (line 21f.). He for his part had faithfully looked after his beloved when she was ill⁶² while the rival had ignored her (lines 25–27).

The warning of the consequences brought about by broken lover's vows, a motif the poet had used in some detail in 1.15, returns in an altered form. The disappointed lover now clearly no longer believes in the disastrous consequences of broken vows; in a mood of resignation he claims in a desperate generalization that the entire female sex is deceitful and unable to keep their word. Somewhat surprisingly but similar to 1.15 he contrasts this accusation with his own eternal love: Never will he abandon the love that has meant so much to him (41–46).

A new motif is introduced in lines 37–40. Having abandoned all hope that his love will be returned, he wants to die: he asks the gods of love to direct their arrows at him and savor their victory.⁶³ New compared with 1.15 is also the anger directed against his rival. In line 1 he had already predicted that his rival would soon suffer the same fate; he, too, would soon be left for someone else. In line 47f. Propertius then hopes his rival will turn to stone while making love. This motif later recurs in conjunction with his own death wish in the two final distiches: The poet projects himself into the myth

⁶¹ Q.S. 3.551–581 suggests that the moving scene of the mourning Briseis might have had an Alexandrian source. See Rohde (1914) 110; Papanghelis (1987) 118f. The grieving Calypso in 1.15.9–14 is a comparable post-Homeric invention.

⁶² Propertius may have taken this very effective motif for expressing outrage from Tib. 1.5.9–17.

⁶³ This image adopts a Greek motif: *A.P.* 12.45 (Poseidippus); see Day (1938) 118. In 2.13.1f. too Propertius represents himself as the target of Amor's arrows.

of the Theban brothers and wants to fight his rival in front of Cynthia's eyes; if he were to kill the rival he would be happy to die.⁶⁴

The changes and the broadening out of the motif sequence compared with the elegy in the first book have led to a continued change of tone. The first distich is rather condescending and sarcastic in the account of what has taken place.⁶⁵ The subsequent mythological examples are presented calmly when, suddenly, in lines 19ff. they are followed by violent accusations and in lines 25ff. by outraged questions. In lines 31–36 his charges against Cynthia turn into a curse of the entire female sex until, in lines 37ff., the desperate lover longs for death. In lines 41–46 he becomes more composed. He casts his mind back over the time of their shared love, and he swears once again he will never love another woman. In the final distichs he then hurls more abuse at his rival.⁶⁶

The transitions, too, become harsher. This is reflected even in the constantly changing addressees. In the fifteenth elegy in the first book he addressed Cynthia throughout the entire poem. Now her presence is excluded because she has turned away from him. So he begins with a personal reflection in lines 1–8, and in line 15f. he addresses a mythical figure expressing sympathy. From line 19 onward he then speaks to Cynthia with mounting excitement as if she were present; in line 21 the rival is also included, while in line 31 the poet extends his address to all women. In lines 38–40 he turns to the gods of love, in lines 41ff. he returns to Cynthia, and in the last distich he addresses his rival again.⁶⁷ The juxtaposition of the two very different books through a comparison of their respective motifs demonstrates clearly how much more complex and brittle many of the elegies of the second book are compared with those in the earlier one.

⁶⁴ In Sen. Phoen. 443ff. and Stat. *Theb.* 11.315ff. Jocasta tries to prevent the brothers from fighting each other. See Shackleton Bailey (1956) 82.

⁶⁵ See Ruhl (2000) 81f.

⁶⁶ The constant changes of mood are examined by La Penna (1951) 32–34; the same (1977) 56f.

⁶⁷ Especially because of these continuous changes Günther (1997a) 15f. like Wackernagel before him suspects an extensive corruption of the text in lines 41–52. However, Propertius tends to use changing addressees as a stylistic tool in his poems to express changing emotions; see Tränkle (1960) 147f.

Tenth elegy

In his introductory poem Propertius like Horace in Odes 1.6 and 2.12 had apologized for his inability, due to his particular talent, to write an epic extolling Augustus' military achievements while still praising the ruler in his own way by recapitulating his great deeds. Now Propertius appears to show his determination to take up the topic in this elegy to the best of his ability. So he too lists the most important successes that would have a place in a eulogy.⁶⁸ In the third book he is going to return to this topic on several occasions.

Even in the very first distich the repetition "it is time, it is time" indicates the urgent tone of the poem. More repetitions follow: *canat*, *canam* in line 8f., *nunc*, *nunc*, *nunc* in lines 9f. and 12, then a whole series of *iam* urgently pressing forward in lines 2.3, 9, 11, 13. Line 1 demonstrates the poet's decision to choose a new tone for his poem. In line 2 he mentions the theme of warfare, and in line 4 more precisely the great deeds of the ruler. In the following he elaborates the motif: Lines 7–12 stress his determination to celebrate the exploits of war, to take his leave from love poetry and to adopt a more serious, loftier tone in his poems. This aspiration is matched appropriately by a solemn appeal to the muses, which replaces the inspiration derived from the beloved in 2.1.4.⁶⁹ In lines 13–18 he sets out the intended topic, namely Augustus' expected campaigns against the Parthians, the Arabs and even against the Indians as well as a country on the most distant of shores as yet outside the reach of Roman power, probably meaning Britain. In the twenties, that is before the British campaign was abandoned and a settlement was found with the Parthians, the countries he mentions were considered the next goals for the Roman policy of expansion⁷⁰ on the way

⁶⁸ Wimmel (1960) 193–200 places the poem in the *recusatio* development. Enk 151f. and H. Fleischmann (1895) 29ff. who is quoted by Enk interpret the poem as a kind of substitute for a panegyric that the elegiac poet is incapable of providing: In 2.10 Propertius, they suggest, praises the achievements of the ruler in his own way. Stahl (1985) 158–162 sees his praise of Augustus's deeds as a pretense. In reality, he believes, Propertius saw these things very differently. However, would he then have said *mei ducis*?

⁶⁹ An appeal to the Muses appears in Propertius otherwise only in the highly stylized poem 4.11.6f.; see Álvarez Hernández (1997) 135.

⁷⁰ This theme is extremely widespread in the Augustan poetry of the period: See Verg. *A.* 6.794–800; 7.604–606; Hor. *C.* 1.2.51f.; 1.12.52–56; 1.35.29–40; 3.3.42–44; 3.5.1–4; Prop. 3.2.9–20; 3.4.1–10; 3.5.47f. The mention of Arabia points to the

to world domination. In line 19f. which concludes this part, the poet confirms his wish to accompany these campaigns and glorify them in his poems. This would be the way to become a great poet.

However, it becomes obvious very quickly in this poem, too, that all this is pie in the sky and not something that can actually be done in the here and now. The first doubts whether his own strength would be sufficient for such an undertaking are silenced at the end of line 5f. with the general statement⁷¹ that even boldness and determination alone are already laudable in such great enterprises. The distinction he then makes starting in line 7 between the young who should sing about love and the old (*extrema aetas!*) who should sing about battles and war, is hardly applicable to his own situation. Propertius is after all still a very young man at the time. It appears, therefore, that he has left the *quando* in line 8 deliberately open to interpretation, whether it is meant to be causal, i.e., in the sense of “since my days as a love poet are over” or temporal, meaning “when they are over”.⁷² Above all, the projected themes show that he is not going to start his war epic immediately. Other than in the opening poem, where the historic topics he mentions could have been tackled there and then, the victories he envisages here lie in the future. What Propertius does is to show his good intentions, but the two *nunc* in the challenge to himself (lines 9–11) and the present tense he uses for the enterprises that are meant to be celebrated (lines 13–16) must be seen in a very general sense. The precise meaning is conveyed by the future tense he uses in the distich concluding this section, line 19f.: The poet will follow these campaigns and will achieve greatness as an epic poet (*vates*). The fact that it is all wishful thinking is clearly stated: May fate preserve him for this great task.

This becomes even clearer in the final section in the image he chooses in line 21f.: If one wanted to honor a high statue without being tall enough to place a wreath on its head, one would have to lay it by its feet. So, being too weak to scale the heights of fame all

years 26/25 BC as the period of the elegy's composition. At that time a campaign against Arabia was being prepared, but eventually had little success; see Enk 162.

⁷¹ Otto (1890) s.v. *velle* No 2 is not aware of any examples before Propertius for this later widespread idea.

⁷² *Quando* tends to be read here in the sense of *quoniam*. Wimmel (1960) 197 and W. R. Nethercut, *SO* (1972) 87f., have doubts about it; the meaning of *quando* ought to be left open, it seems.

he can do now (*nunc!*) is to present a more modest gift, presumably the poem in hand, praising Augustus in the way a weak person is capable of.⁷³ The last distich changes to yet another image. The ascent from the river Permessos that flows through the plain, to the heights of the Helicon with its source of poetry signifies the ascent to a higher form of poetry.⁷⁴ Propertius does not think he can muster the strength for it; the move into a different genre of poetry that he had aspired to in lines 1–2 is not, therefore, within his grasp. The *nondum* in line 25, on the other hand, at least leaves open the possibility that the turning point will come one day and he will achieve the move into the noble poetic form of the epic.

Eleventh elegy

Like some other poets of antiquity since Sappho and Pindarus, Propertius was convinced that his verses bestowed fame even after death on the person praised in them. Especially in Elegy 3.2.17–26 he elaborates this idea with great self-confidence: Lucky the girl who is celebrated in his poems. These verses will be an everlasting memorial to her beauty that will survive in all eternity.⁷⁵

In our short and epigrammatic poem the disappointed poet denies this favor to his unfaithful beloved. Whether she is celebrated by someone else or not mentioned at all does not matter to anyone, he claims. All her gifts that he has extolled in elegy 2.3.25 will dissolve without his poetic praises, he predicts.⁷⁶ In the last distich he prophesies that people will pass her grave without noticing it; nobody will say, this was the grave of a girl favored by the muses.⁷⁷ Only he,

⁷³ In l. 22f. the readings *hic* and *culmen* are the most convincing; see Enk ad 22. 23.

⁷⁴ The idea that the river Permessos and the Hippocrene on the heights of Helicon inspire to different kinds of poetry can be traced to Verg. *Ecl.* 6.64–73 and Callimachus's prologue to the Aetia: Call. fr. 2.1; 696 Pf. and Call. fr. 2a Pf. (in the addenda, vol. 2, 102f.). See Wimmel (1960) 233–38.

⁷⁵ Propertius here clearly follows Hor. *C.* 3.30 in his formulation. But in 1.15.24 Propertius already believes himself capable of making the beloved as famous as the great lovers of mythology. In 2.25.3f. and 2.34.93f. he hopes that Cynthia will be made famous by his poetry. See also 2.5.5f. and Tib. 1.4.65f.

⁷⁶ See the interpretation by Álvarez Hernández (1997) 142.

⁷⁷ *Doctus* is an attribute used frequently with reference to poetry. The Muses and poets are particularly entitled to it: Cat. 65.2; Hor. *C.* 1.1.29; Prop. 2.30.16,38;

Propertius, could have provided her with this fame. The laconic brevity and harshness of these verses are reminiscent of the two last poems of the third book in which Propertius separates from his beloved. But in our poem the separation is not final, it is just another aspect of the varying moods expressed in his love poetry.

Twelfth elegy

To ascribe the contradictions and pains of love to the characteristics or attributes of Eros was a favorite game in Hellenistic epigrams.⁷⁸ His 'fact file' in epigram *A.P.* 9.449 by Moschus is particularly comprehensive. All the attributes and comparable interpretations used by Propertius are to be found here.⁷⁹ However, the almost overloaded epigram has a different character. Several epigrams by Meleager are more comparable in their descriptive manner: *A.P.* 5.177 also presents a 'portrait' of Eros using three distinguishing features that are the same as Propertius'. Here, too, Eros is a mere boy, he has wings and arrows, but his childlike traits are more emphasized, as they also are in *A.P.* 5.178. On the other hand, *A.P.* 5.190 shows how dangerous he can be, by comparing the storms of love tossing about the lovers with the storms on the sea. The threat posed by his fire-arrows is described by *A.P.* 5.180 as well as by Leonidas in *A.P.* 5.188. There are many more similarities in a number of other poets. The comic poet Eubulus,⁸⁰ looking at the pictorial depiction, doubts that the wings are appropriate for the nature of Eros. Eros does not fly away, after all, once he has hit a person with his arrow. Similarly, Meleager maintains in *A.P.* 5.215.5f. that the wings of the Eros figures are suitable only for arriving, not for leaving. Finally, the plea to the love god to find another victim because the poet

2.34.79; 3.21.28; 3.23.1; [Verg.] *Catal.* 4.8; 9.2.20; Propertius even addresses his beloved in this way in 1.7.11 and 2.13.11; see also *Cat.* 35.17; *Hor. C.* 1.9.7; *Tib.* 1.4.61; [*Tib.*] 3.6.41; 4.6.2.

⁷⁸ Burck (1966a) 54–64 provides the most thorough examination of the influence of these Hellenistic motifs on Propertius. But perhaps he puts too much emphasis on the Roman character of this elegy. With the exception of the final phrase the elegy keeps very close to Hellenistic motifs.

⁷⁹ A close parallel to lines 7 and 17 in our elegy is *A.P.* 9.440.16f. Similar in this respect is also *C. Anacreont.* 13.14–17 West.

⁸⁰ *Athen.* 13.562c.

cannot bear pursuit any longer is also to be found in Greek epigrams: *A.P.* 5.98 (Archias); 5.79.9f. (Meleager).⁸¹

The structure of the elegy is well balanced. In twelve lines the familiar characteristics of Eros-Amor are described; in the next twelve lines the poet examines how they relate to his own person. In each part the motifs are introduced in three groups each in two distichs.

In the first sequence of lines the poet acknowledges how apt the depiction of Eros tends to be in paintings since his attributes reflect the lovers' behavior and what happens to them. He then describes the details largely in the manner of the Greek tradition. Like a boy the lovers live without thinking and recklessly waste what they have got. The fast wings⁸² are appropriate because the lovers are tossed about in the storms of love like a ship in a storm at sea, and like it they are at the mercy of changing winds. The quiver and arrows too fit in extremely well.⁸³ Amor, after all, hits his target before anyone suspects his presence, and when he scores a hit the victim is mortally wounded.

In the second part of the poem the poet then relates the picture to himself. The transition is well prepared. From line 7 onward he no longer refers to the lovers but includes himself: The use of 'we' and 'our' shows that this is also about his story. In line 13f. he says that the reckless nature of a boy and the injury caused by Amor's arrow both apply to him, but Amor must have lost his wings when he wounded the poet because he will not leave his heart and continues to rage within it. He then addresses the god himself. In pitiful tones he asks: What pleasure is he deriving from not leaving him; his strength is ebbing away and he is totally exhausted. The god should find a more rewarding victim for his arrows, as he is barely alive and the god is tormenting the mere shadow of a human being.

⁸¹ Comparable in terms of the listing of attributes and their interpretation is Cornutus *ND* 25, who obviously draws on this tradition, but it is more likely that the poetic tradition itself rather than the equivalent of a mythological compendium was the starting point for Propertius. See Boucher (1965) 262f.

⁸² Camps ad 6 interprets *humano corde* as an ablativus separativus ("fly from"), however, the following distich speaks of the effect Amor has on the human heart. The explanation as ablativus loci offered by Enk ad 6 seems to be a better one. See Mosch. 1.17; Ov. *Am.* 2.9,2.

⁸³ In line 10 *utroque* is strange. The word was presumably meant to make Amor's weapons appear more dangerous, but it is not really appropriate for a pictorial representation. See Shackleton Bailey (1956) 85f.

Up to this point there are parallels for Propertius's thinking in Hellenistic poetry. The final phrases in the two last distichs, however, are unusual. The poet rebels against Amor. If the god were to destroy him he would lose the poet who sings his praises and who is able to celebrate the beauty of his beloved in poetry. The individual aspects of this poetic celebration refer clearly to poems in which he has done precisely this.⁸⁴ So Propertius here obviously sees himself with unmistakable pride as the love poet of Rome who cannot easily be replaced by another.⁸⁵

Thirteenth elegy

The middle part of the elegy, lines 17–42, takes up central motifs of elegy 19 in the first book. Here as there Cynthia's presence at his funeral which he clearly envisages as imminent, is important to him. In 1.19.3f. he is not so much afraid of death as of the absence of the grieving Cynthia from his funeral cortège. Here he asks the beloved to arrange his funeral in a manner appropriate for a poet (lines 18–36). Both elegies contain the notion that a great love does not end with death, and in a strange exaggeration even the claim that the ashes of the dead can still feel love and long for the loved one (1.19.5f. compared with 2.13.42; see also 3.15.46).⁸⁶ This is why it is so important to the poet that Cynthia grieves at his graveside (1.19.21f. compared with 2.13.41; see also 1.17.22–24; 2. 24.35f. 51f.; 3.16.23f.) and will one day rest in his grave (1.19.17f. compared with 2.13.39f.; see also 4.7.93f.). Only the traditional concept of an after-life in Hades (1.19.7–10.13–16) does not recur in the later elegy.

The beginnings of the elegies are, however, completely different from each other. While 1.19 starts off immediately with thoughts of the approaching death, 2.13 leads into life to begin with. On the other hand, all the motifs by which the central part of 2.13 is expanded compared with 1.19 are prepared in the introductory part in lines 1–16, and the use of the same motifs turns the poem into

⁸⁴ See also, for instance 1.1; 1.4.9–14; 2.1.5–8.

⁸⁵ The fundamental shift in the two final distichs and its significance have been stressed by Burck (1966a) 63f.

⁸⁶ See Burck (1966a) 195; Hubbard (1974) 35f.; Warden (1980) 66–69.

a homogenous whole despite the change in the setting. The first distich begins with the image of Amor having pierced the poet's heart with innumerable arrows,⁸⁷ so now he is racked by never-ending pains. He returns to this motif only in the final part of the poem. In line 3 Propertius turns to his poetry. The same god who sends him the pain also gives him the means to assuage it. He is the god that inspires him and encourages him to compose verses with which he hopes to gain Cynthia's love.⁸⁸ Propertius describes the Muses he must follow as delicate and sensitive, in other words, he aspires to the poetry of Callimachus.⁸⁹ It is verses like these, above all, that please the artistic sense of the beloved (of the *docta puella*), and she likes listening to them. And if the poem can count on her approbation he, like Callimachus,⁹⁰ can easily do without the approbation of the dumb crowd. Thus love and poetry are intimately connected, and the character of this poetry is Callimachean. Another motif that is going to play a part later is the thought of fame as a poet in line 8. Here Propertius hopes to be better known than the singer Linus, who was as famous as Orpheus.⁹¹

The thoughts of death appear as suddenly in line 17 as they do earlier in 2.1.71 and are couched in almost identical words. The link with the earlier poem lies in the continuation of the motif: If Propertius wins the love of Cynthia with the help of his poetry he

⁸⁷ The poet as aim for the innumerable arrows sent by Eros or the Cupids, is a common motif of the Greek epigram: *A.P.* 5.188 (Leonidas); 12.45 (Poseidippus); 12.166 (Asclepiades). In line 1 *amantur Susa*, i.e., the text from Pico's manuscript, is an illuminating correction, made presumably by a humanist scholar.

⁸⁸ Propertius here modifies 2.1.3f. There the beloved was the source of his inspiration, here the god of love. The notion that flattering verses please the beloved and are a means of winning her love is already a motif of the first book: 1.7.11; 1.8.39; 1.9.11f. In 2.34.1–58 he picks up the motif as advice to lovers, and in 3.2.1–10 he is convinced of its effectiveness. See Boucher (1965) 240; Stroth (1971) 9–73, 66–78.

⁸⁹ The *graciles Musae* point to Call. fr. 1.24 Pf. and ep. 27.3; see W. Kullmann in Radke (1998) 168. The grove of Ascrea points to Hesiod's place of the Muses, to which Callimachus believes himself transported in the dream of the prologue to the *Aetia*: Schol. Flor. ad Call. fr. 2 Pf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.64–73 also has this, but in the scene of Gallus's calling to poetry it is a muse that inspires him, not Amor.

⁹⁰ See Call. fr. 1.25–28 Pf.; *Epp.* 28.4; Cat. 95, 10; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.74–77. L. P. Wilkinson, *CR* 16 (1966) 141ff., points out the Callimachean aspects of both parts of the poem. See also Alvarez Hernández (1997) 156, 158.

⁹¹ Verg. *Ecl.* 4.55; see Enk ad 8. The fame motif has already appeared in 1.7.9f. and is heavily stressed later in 3.1.35f. and 3.2.19–26. It is entirely consistent with the Callimachean credo: Call. fr. 7.13f. Pf.; Cat. 95.5f.

can hope that she will arrange a funeral for him which is appropriate for a poet.⁹² In the same way as he lightly dismisses the applause of the crowds (line 13f.) he rejects a funeral involving pomp and extravagance (lines 19–23). His liking for the small scale in poetry predisposes him to simplicity (line 24). What is important to him is not the external display, but the fact that he has created his love poetry (line 25f.)⁹³ and that his beloved will mourn him (lines 27–29). Furthermore, his grave is to be worthy of a poet. A laurel tree, the tree of Apollo, is to give it shade, and an inscription is to refer to him as a love poet who had only a single love in his life.⁹⁴ As in the introductory part, here, too, the connection between poetry and love is the central motif. The fame motif from line 8, too, is taken up: His grave will not be less well known than the grave of the great Archilles (line 37f.)

In this entire part of the poem up to line 42 the agonies of love that the first distich had spoken of so eloquently are lost from sight. In the final part the poet then makes up for this omission. In line 43f. he groans that he wishes he had died in his early childhood, in any case before he was struck by the arrows of love.⁹⁵ And apparently nothing can compensate for the suffering he has had to bear, not even his poetry or the fame engendered by it. Old Nestor who

⁹² On the connection between these two sections of the poem see La Penna (1951) 38f.; the same (1977) 54f., 160f.; Enk 179f. In 3.16.23–30 Propertius repeats the image of a poet's grave mourned over by his beloved far from the crowds.

⁹³ In order to explain the *tres libelli* envisaged by Propertius Lachmann XXI–XXVIII believes that the present second book was fused artificially from two original books (2.1–9; 10–34) after a text loss during the early transmission. This hypothesis was taken up by Hubbard (1975) 41f. and O. Skutsch, *HSCP* 79 (1975) 229–233). J. K. King, *WJA* 6 b (1980) 61ff., and Günther (1997a) 9–14 suggest an original division between 2.12 and 2.13. Lyne (1998c) believes 2.12 to be the original prologue poem of a third book. However, the introductory and closing poems of the second book relate so clearly to each other that the notion this book might be the chance product of transmission does not carry much conviction. In addition, Nonius p. 169,28 M quotes the elegy 3.21 as coming from the third book. See E. Reisch in Eisenhut (1975) 62 and the extensive discussion in Enk (1946) 1.19–29.

⁹⁴ Propertius here modifies one of Callimachus' motifs. In *Epp.* 35 = *A.P.* 7.415 he composes a funerary epigram for himself in which he describes himself above all as a poet of symposium poetry. On the prevalence of this motif, see W. Kullmann in Radke (1998) 172f.

⁹⁵ The pessimistic view that it would have been better not to have been born, or, at least, to have died in early childhood, had been frequently used since Theogn. 425–428 and Soph. *OC* 1224–1228. La Penna (1951) 38,1 cites numerous examples for this prevailing mood from Greek authors.

would have been much happier if he had not had to witness the death of his son serves him as an example for the uselessness of a long life.⁹⁶

In the final part of the elegy (lines 51–58) its motifs cease. Propertius once more addresses Cynthia. He is convinced that she will mourn for him once he has gone. And like in elegy 1.19 where he had closed with the exhortation to the beloved that she ought to give him her love now rather than her tears later, he implies something similar here when he says that the grief for the dead cannot bring him back to life, and suggests one ought to make the most of life for as long as possible.

At first sight the poem with its several changes between speeches in monologue form and addresses to the beloved as well as the abrupt transitions after lines 16, 42, and 50 may appear very heterogeneous, in terms of its motifs; however, it makes a coherent statement about the nature of Propertius' own poetry and the connection between love and love poetry.

Fourteenth elegy

The poem opens triumphantly with four mythological comparisons. Having finally been granted a night of love Propertius compares his happiness to some of the happiest moments experienced by familiar mythological figures, indeed—even places it above theirs with the *non ita* or *nec sic* repeated four times at the beginning of the lines describing them. Typically these mythological examples show happiness finally achieved after much grief and distress. Agamemnon had had to fight for ten years, Odysseus to wander lost on the seas for just as long; Electra had believed her brother dead and grieved pitifully over her loss, and Ariadne had to fear for her lover who was fighting to overcome the monstrous Minotaur. In this way the mythological examples alone show that Propertius has found his happiness only after a great deal of heartache and pain. Now, however, he feels he has at last reached the summit of happiness and is raised way above the fate of ordinary human beings, comparable in his happiness only to the admired figures of Greek mythology.

⁹⁶ In line 48 the conjecture *barbarus*, introduced into the text by Camps in parallel to 3.8.31, is pleasing.

So it seems that the examples from mythology have no other purpose than to lend something like a celestial glow to his own happiness. To the reader of antiquity, on the other hand, these examples must have appeared somewhat ambivalent. He would have known, after all, that Agamemnon was murdered by his wife shortly after his triumph, that Odysseus was facing a fight to the death on his arrival in Ithaka, that Electra's beloved brother would sink deeply into guilt and be gripped by madness immediately after their encounter, and the name Ariadne conjured up not so much her happiness on Theseus' safe return as her laments when he abandoned her soon after.⁹⁷

The reader is, therefore, hardly astonished when the poet continues in a very different tone after the triumphant first ten lines. He now thinks back to what had gone before. Cynthia had long been deaf to his pleas and complaints and had rejected him haughtily and unmoved by his suffering. Indeed, the images of the dried-up lake and the fire having turned to ashes show that his vitality has dwindled, that the "oh, so late" had almost turned into a "too late". Also, the means of finally winning Cynthia's love, the lover's ruse⁹⁸ of playing cool and uninterested himself for once, makes the happiness he has gained in this way appear extremely precarious. One has to ask oneself whether the ruse might not have lost its effectiveness after one successful use.

In lines 21–28 his feelings of happiness regain the upper hand. The poet remembers how the girl lovingly nestled against him while rejected lovers went on calling for her in vain outside. In a renewed burst of triumph he swears this victory means more to him than a victory over the Parthians and the magnificent triumph following it.⁹⁹ And, like the generals who immortalize their victories in epigraphs he will put up a dedicatory epigraph, to the goddess of love in her temple to thank her.

One might have thought that this epigraph given in line 27f. would have provided the poem with a suitable ending. However, just as before his feelings of happiness had been superceded by thoughts of

⁹⁷ Ruhl (2000) 98f. notes this ambiguity. See also Lyne (1980) 100.

⁹⁸ The *contemnite, amantes!* has the sound of a generally useful rule: Ovid advises the girls in *AA* 3.579–584 that an occasional rebuff enflames the love of their admirers. See also *Ov. Am* 1.8.73f.

⁹⁹ In another image of triumph in 3.1.9–14 Propertius's poetry triumphs. Ovid makes Amor triumph in *Am.* 1.2.23–46. This widely used motif is pursued by Cairns (1972) 95–97.

the long period of despair preceding it, he now follows the triumphant dedication with a view into the future in the last two distiches. In line 29 he addresses the beloved for the first time: *mea lux*; she is the happiness of his life. With this address everything changes.¹⁰⁰ Until now Propertius has tended to see his happiness as the result of a successful conquest; symptomatic is, for instance, that he boasts about his lover's ruse and uses the comparison with the triumphant general and his captives, his loot and his victor's epigraph. As he now faces his beloved in person, however, he realizes that his happiness rests not so much on his powers of conquest as on her bestowing her favor on him. The tone of the last two distiches is uncertain and questioning. Propertius is not at all sure that the 'ship of love' will have a happy landing.¹⁰¹ Full of doubt he wonders whether 'the ship' will be safely pulled up on the shore,—in other words, reach the longed-for destination, or run aground in the shallows.¹⁰² In the final lines he then even expresses his determination not to survive a new change of mind by Cynthia. In this case he wants to lie dead on her threshold.

Fifteenth elegy

The elegy begins with a number of exclamations.¹⁰³ The poet seems almost unable to grasp the enormous happiness bestowed on him by the night of love that Cynthia has granted him. He recalls many details, the whisperings of love they exchanged in the glow of the lamp, the games of love they played when the lamp had been removed, how the beloved procrastinated and covered herself again

¹⁰⁰ This change is noted by Reitzenstein (1936) 73.

¹⁰¹ The port reached after a stormy sea crossing is used as an image for the goal of love also in *A.P.* 12.167 (Meleager). See also *A.P.* 5.156; 5.190; 12.157 (Meleager); *A.P.* 12.156 (anon.). In 3.24.15 Propertius uses the metaphor in the opposite sense as being safe in the port *from* the storms of love.

¹⁰² The terms *ad te* and *mea lux* move the poem from the image level to the level of reality, but in such a familiar metaphor the image is in any case always transparent; the poet's intention is in the reader's mind at all times.

¹⁰³ The ecstatic address to the 'little bed' of the pleasures of love has a precedent in *A.P.* 5.4.5 (Philodemus) and in Tícidas fr. 1 Morel. The lamp mentioned is also a much used motif of Greek erotic poetry: *A.P.* 5.4.5.6.7.8; see Day (1938) 121; Boucher (1965) 413.

with her tunic and, he continues, how Cynthia had roused him with her kisses when he had flagged. He ends this set of lines with renewed rapturous exclamations as he remembers the endless variety of their embraces and how he could find no end to kissing her.

The next section of the poem, lines 11–24, leads to the climax of their night of love. Having given an account of it up to now and referred to his beloved in the third person, the poet now addresses her and imagines himself in the actual situation as if she were still present.¹⁰⁴ The change in the manner of speech is prepared in lines 3 and 9 where he has chosen to use the present tense and in line 10 in which he addresses the beloved directly (*tuis*). The poet says he does not only want to hold her in his arms but to admire her naked beauty and so to increase his desire.¹⁰⁵ And as so often at the climax of his elegies the poet now introduces comparisons from mythology. It was the naked Helena who had bewitched Paris, he says, and the naked Endymion had lain with the naked Semele. Like them, he too wants to see his beloved naked. If she resists he will tear off her tunic, yes, even hurt her perhaps in the frenzy of his love, and she will be able to show the bruises on her arms to her mother in the morning. In contrast to the beginning of the poem here at its climax the lover alone is the active partner and gives free rein to his passion. In the distich that concludes this part, in line 23f., Catullus's motif of the brevity of life which one ought to make the most of¹⁰⁶ appears for the first time, here in conjunction with the night-light metaphor. They ought to love each other for as long as possible, literally: to feast their eyes on each other. This is how the theme of the feast for the eyes that feeds his passion concludes.

¹⁰⁴ This is how it is explained in Camps 125. It is seen differently by F. Stoessl, *WS* 63 (1948) 108–116. According to him the poem describes the exact course of events during the night with the sections of the poem in which Cynthia is addressed in the third person (lines 1–8, 31–48) having their place in the intervening periods when she is asleep. Such a naturalistic depiction is, however, hardly Propertius' way of writing. His elegies are literary constructs which move freely from narrative to visualization to reflection. Tränkle (1960) 147–149 stresses the quick changes between monologue and address as a major characteristic of Propertius' creative process.

¹⁰⁵ The later epigrams *A.P.* 5.128 and 252, which have similar motifs, are likely to be based on Hellenistic models; see Abel (1930) 18. Boucher (1965) 58 demonstrates with reference to 3.13.38 and 3.14.4 and 19f. that the pleasure in naked female beauty is a common trait of Propertius' poetry.

¹⁰⁶ See Cat. 5.4–6, but also Prop. 1.19.25f. and Tib. 1.1.69f.

In the next part, in lines 25–30, the poet wishes that the happiness of the moment may be granted permanence. Like Catullus in the 109th poem he hopes for a lasting union with the beloved, using the image of him and her indivisibly chained together¹⁰⁷ as well as the proverbially faithful doves as an image of a perfect union.¹⁰⁸ The concluding distich of this part, too, is close to Catullus.¹⁰⁹ Like Propertius he too had said in his seventh poem that his mad passion knew no limits and no measure.

In lines 31–48 Cynthia is no longer addressed. The poet returns to general reflections about his love. He begins with a number of wide-ranging and, therefore, emphatic so-called *adynata*, all expressing the same thought: nature itself would reverse its course before he would love anybody other than the beloved of this happy night.¹¹⁰ He would be hers in life and death.¹¹¹ He knows, of course, that his happiness does not depend on him alone, but if his beloved were to grant him such a night as this one only occasionally (*interdum*), a single year of his life would become an indefinite period. Many such nights would raise him above all earthly happiness as he had already said in the preceding elegy.¹¹²

In lines 41–48 the poet's reflections seem to move right away from their starting point. He thinks in a very general way about his choice of lifestyle. As before in elegy 2.7 he defends his way of life devoted to love against the more highly regarded Roman values of an active life dedicated to the state. In writing of his limbs heavy with wine

¹⁰⁷ The association of ideas in lines 25–30 is explained by Alfonsi (1945) 41. A chain, fetter or bond are common images for an indissoluble union; see Hor. *C.* 1.13.17f.; Tib. 2.2.17–20; [Tib.] 3.11.15f.; Ov. *Met.* 4.678f.; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.43f. In verse 26 the second person *velles* is seen as difficult; the life span of the relationship does, after all, depend on both partners. However, as Reitzenstein (1936) 80f. and Shackleton Bailey (1956) 92f. explain, Propertius presupposes his own willingness to make the relationship permanent while the uncertain *velles* shows that he is not certain that Cynthia shares this willingness.

¹⁰⁸ See Otto (1890) s.v. *columba* No 2.

¹⁰⁹ See Camps ad 29f.

¹¹⁰ In line 35 *calores* fits in better with the images of happiness of the poem than *dolores*. In 1.10.13 *dolores* describes a very different kind of love; see Giardina 155.

¹¹¹ Propertius swears frequently that in death, too, he wants to be united with his beloved: 2.20.17f.; 2.28.42. See also 2.13.42 and the references mentioned there.

¹¹² In line 37 Housman's reading *interdum* prepares for the intensification in line 39; line 40 explains line 39; "to be a God" was a turn of phrase expressing the highest degree of happiness: *A.P.* 5.55.2 (Dioscorides); Plaut. *Curc.* 167; Ter. *Hec.* 843; *Heaut.* 693.

in line 42 he does not exactly display very high aspirations for his way of life, but he points out that the world would be a different place if we all lived in this way: There would be no wars, and Rome would not have to mourn the deaths caused by so many civil wars.¹¹³ Thus far the argument is perfectly plausible for someone who himself had still been touched by the horrors of civil war in his youth. However, when Propertius comes to mourn the deaths caused by the battle of Actium, which he visualizes in gruesome detail, this has to appear provocative. This battle was, after all, the founding event of the Augustan reign. One can hardly fail to notice the reservations expressed here about the predominant 'Zeitgeist'.

The last six lines are again addressed directly to Cynthia. In picturing the end of a banquet Propertius returns to the theme of line 23f. and entreats the beloved to savour the joys of life while its light is shining and assures her in the tone of Catullus's kissing poems, however many kisses she gives him they would never be enough.

Sixteenth elegy

Comedies often show young men in love in an ironic light. A good example is Phaedria in Terence's *Eunuchus*, who has been shut out by his beloved and now is torn by conflicting emotions.¹¹⁴ It is precisely in such a role that Propertius presents himself here taking up a motif from the first book: The praetor whom Cynthia had wanted to accompany to his province in elegy 1.8 only to stay with the poet after all, has returned with rich pickings. With the help of his gifts he immediately regains Cynthia's favor, and the poet finds himself betrayed and deserted.

He frequently addresses Cynthia in this elegy, but this is no more than passionate visualization. He does not create a situation in which the poem could be imagined as spoken to Cynthia. It is, therefore, a passionate monologue wherein Cynthia is also spoken of in the third person (lines 11f.; 17f.). The poem shows no clear development

¹¹³ Later he expands this idea in a positive way in 3.5.1–12: Lovers venerate peace; since they have no desire for treasures, they don't think much of the way of life of merchant adventurers or soldiers greedy for loot. Tibullus shares this view in 1.10. See Burck (1966a) 199f.

¹¹⁴ Ter. *Eun.* 45–73. Hubbard (1974) 61 refers to it.

of motifs, allowing the thoughts instead to drift erratically and seemingly aimlessly.

The beginning of the poem soberly states the facts and neatly characterizes Cynthia's main motivation and his own despair in the juxtaposition of *maxima praeda* and *maxima cura*. At first, when he bids Cynthia to fleece the 'dumb beast' and having plundered him sent him packing (lines 7–10), it seems that the poet wants to accept the situation. But this is nothing but an artificial pose adopted with difficulty. That is obvious from his wish in line 3f., if only the praetor had perished at sea, and from the plaintively repeated words *sine me* in line 5f. So it does not come as a surprise when the advice to take the loot is later withdrawn: In lines 43–46 the poet wishes that all the gifted treasures would dissolve into air, water, and earth.¹¹⁵ His seeming composure is, therefore, vanquished quickly by the power of his emotions.

The emotions expressed by him at the beginning recur repeatedly; the sadness of his troubled heart remains the main tune: line 13: *dolori*, line 31f.: *nostros fletus*, *dolor hic*, in 33f.: the lachrymose self-pity. The reason why Cynthia is open to seduction, her cupidity, is discussed in detail. The fundamental characteristic of the common hetaera is thus applied to Cynthia in lines 11f. and 15–18, which is then matched by the generalizations in lines 21 and 25f.¹¹⁶ All this is contrasted in lines 19–22 with a wishful reference to the poverty of ancient Rome where women were not seduced by rich gifts. Cynthia's unscrupulous surrender to the wealthy seducer is also revealed with brutal frankness: In line 6 her door stands open for him all through the night; in line 23f. she lies with him seven nights in succession holding in her white arms the repellant man who is disparaged in line 27f. as a barbarian with his health undermined by debauchery and accused of having purloined the poet's 'kingdom'.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ This is a topos of erotic poetry: Tib. 1.9. 11f.; 2.4.39f. Ov. *Am* 3.8.65f.

¹¹⁶ How common this view was, is shown by Leo (1912) 149f. Like here in line 17 Cynthia demands presents from Propertius also in 2.24.11–14. In 1.8.31–42; 2.20.25f.; 2.26.23–26 her characterization shows the opposite. The accusation Propertius levels against her here, therefore, hardly presents an objective picture; it rather reflects the anger of one who has been rejected for a preferred rival. See Boucher (1965) 448, 470f.

¹¹⁷ Wistrand (1977) 55–77 sees a reference to Verg *Ecl.* 1.67–72 in the expressions *mea regna* and *barbarus* which are unusual in this context. The fact that he establishes a parallel with a military plundering campaign demonstrates the depth of the poet's anger.

In line 35f. she is deaf to his accusations that love of this kind is shameful. His outbursts of hatred against the seducer form another recurring motif: If only his ship had been wrecked on a promontory (line 3f.) and if only he would perish from his dissipation, Propertius wishes in helpless rage (line 13f.). In the literature of antiquity there is little that is comparable to this kind of outburst of uncontrolled emotions.¹¹⁸ Closest to it in its disposition are some examples by Tibullus; but Propertius is more passionate.

The excessive nature of passion is also demonstrated in line 29f. in his choice of mythological examples meant as warning; these are examples of women who found their deaths as a result of their greed for gold, which is, after all, not particularly applicable to Cynthia. Even less appropriate is the reference to the triumvir Marc Antony who was ruined by his blind love. Cynthia's mistake is not at all blind love but greed for money! With this not-quite-appropriate choice of examples Propertius appears to want to satirize himself as blindly reaching for something especially off-putting in his mood of despair. The erratic character of the whole poem also includes in line 41 a genuflection before the bringer of peace Augustus, for which there seems to be little occasion at this point. He appears even more helpless in his wrath when he threatens with the lightning wrath of Zeus as a punishment for perjury (an image he expands into a broad picture of nature in line 49f.). After all, no motif was more familiar than the proverbial wisdom that Zeus leaves broken lover's vows unpunished.¹¹⁹ And the poet cannot possibly be serious when he depicts Zeus as a lover who, like him, has been deceived and left to lament his fate.¹²⁰ In which of his many amorous adventures might the god not have been successful? These helpless threats also seem to imply a certain ironic detachment, and with that a little distance from the extremes of the poet's emotions as they were expressed in the middle of the poem.

¹¹⁸ In order to tone down the erratic nature of these lines changes in their order were considered several times, but the attempt to bring order into this image of a chaotic emotional state may well be a 'Love's Labour's Lost'. A text in which two distichs are moved and lines 31–42 are taken out is proposed by Günther (1997a) 26, 35–38, 54f.

¹¹⁹ See the collection of references to Tib. 1.4.21–26 by K. F. Smith. Propertius had already threatened with divine punishment for broken lover's vows in 1.15.33–38. The jocular tone shows that he was not serious about it, neither then nor now.

¹²⁰ The unserious nature of this section of the poem is illuminated by Boucher (1965) 429f. and La Penna (1977) 62.

Seventeenth elegy

Since Scaliger the homogeneity of this poem has often been questioned, and it or parts of it have been added on to adjacent texts. As Enk shows, however, the sixteenth elegy has a distinct conclusion in line 55f., and its themes, too, are fully explored. Equally conclusive is the final distich of the seventeenth elegy. Here the decision to remain faithful to the beloved despite everything does not relate at all to the beginning of the eighteenth elegy which recommends an appropriate conduct toward the beloved. On the other hand, the interchange of the distichs lines 13f. and 15f. demanded by Lachmann makes for greater coherence: *nec licet* in line 15 really only connects smoothly with line 12.¹²¹

The beginning of the poem contains thoughts that cross the mind of the disappointed poet during his sleepless nights. In morbid exaggeration he sees a girl who has broken her vows and is stringing along her lover with blood on her hands like a murderess. Equally excessive are the mythological comparisons in lines 5–10 where Propertius describes the agonies of love as harsher than the torments suffered by Tantalus and Sisyphus in the underworld. This particular comparison may have been inspired by the third book of Lucretius who in lines 978–1023 interprets the torments of the underworld as images for the anguish of human beings tormented by their passions in this world. While Lucretius' choice of representative figures is different, the ever unquenched thirst of Tantalus and the always vain efforts of Sisyphus are wholly suitable images for the state of mind of an unhappy lover. Elsewhere, too, the longings of love are compared with tormenting thirst.¹²²

Having finished in line 9 with the conclusion that it is a most unhappy state to be entangled by love and no sensible person would wish for it, Propertius then considers his own specific case in lines 11ff. He used to be Cynthia's much envied favorite; now he is lucky if he is allowed to visit her once in ten days. Others have clearly stolen a march on him. He may not even lie at her threshold in a moonlit night¹²³ whispering sweet words of love through the chinks

¹²¹ After F. Cairns Fedeli defends the transmitted verse sequence with a reference to Ov. *Her.* 15.133. But is that truly comparable?

¹²² Lyne (1980) 297 compares Ov. *Rem.* 247, 533, 632 and [Verg.] *Ciris* 163.

¹²³ In line 15 *sicca luna* is an unusual expression. It probably means a cold night with a clear sky. Camps ad 15 compares it with Ov. *Tr.* 1.2.29 and 3.10.53.

of her door as the rejected lovers in the erotic poetry of antiquity did. So he longs for death. He contemplates throwing himself from a rock or taking poison. But then, in the final distich, comes an unexpected turn. Despite everything that has happened he does not want to renounce his beloved and hopes she will be moved by his devotion and bestow her love on him again.

Eighteenth elegy, lines 1–22

In the elegies 1.15.9–16 and 2.9.2–16 Propertius brought to the attention of the not-particularly-constant beloved examples of unswerving constancy found among the women of ancient times. Now he returns to this motif with a related myth. Of Eos or Aurora, the goddess of the dawn, the story goes that she made a mortal, Tithonus by name, her husband.¹²⁴ In our elegy¹²⁵ Propertius has apparently yet again a good reason for complaining about Cynthia withdrawing her affections from him. *Odisti me* in line 19 puts it very strongly, indeed, but the actual situation is hardly more than hinted at.¹²⁶ It is the mythological example that the poet appears to be really interested in. In the first two distichs he tries to overcome his grief with rational reflections: persistent complaining only puts a woman off. It is better to overlook the infidelities of the beloved. His silent suffering might soften her heart. But such sensible reasoning does not stand up. In line 5f. his indignation breaks through, and Propertius asks himself how Cynthia would treat him if he were no longer the young lover but already old with grey hair and wrinkles in his face.

This somewhat surprising thought has been chosen for the sake of the following mythological example. Here he shows the love of Eos for the aging lover full of moving little touches. He describes how she was never contemptuous of his age but on her return from the sky she would embrace him fondly before seeing to her horses. And after lying in his arms at night she would complain bitterly in the morning that she had to start off on another journey through

¹²⁴ Hy. Hom. 5.218–238 tells the myth differently. Eos loved Tithonos only as long as he was young. The change found in Propertius may already have been made in a Hellenistic telling of the myth.

¹²⁵ After line 22 an entirely new topic begins, i.e., a new poem starts. Since Kuineol (1805) all editors have made this a new beginning.

¹²⁶ Enk 253f. explains the context of the poem and the development of its ideas.

the skies. The ever youthful goddess had not been ashamed of sleeping with an old man but kissed his grey hair. One asks oneself, of course, how seriously the poet took this touching story in the Hellenistic taste and whether he might not have smiled a little about himself, when he presented this sentimental ideal of devoted love to his hot-blooded and capricious beloved.

In line 19 Propertius then addresses her directly and points out the difference between her attitude and that of the mythological example. In contrast to the loving goddess she, Cynthia, has turned away from him and is unfaithful, although he is still at the height of his powers. But he also draws another conclusion from the mythological story: In contrast to the ever youthful goddess Cynthia would herself soon know what it is to be old.¹²⁷ This can only be a disguised request to adopt a more sensible attitude: The beloved should make better use of the fleeting years of her life. In the final distich the poet has recovered his composure. In the reasonable tone of the poem's first part he urges himself to stop fretting since love is, after all, capricious.

Eighteenth elegy, lines 23–38

Propertius here takes up the motif of Elegy 1.2. There he had asked Cynthia to relinquish her makeup since natural beauty is more pleasing in his view. This exhortation is, of course, not really about the aesthetics of appearances; Propertius is, in fact, secretly annoyed because Cynthia is using the techniques employed by the hetaerae of Rome wishing to attract admirers.¹²⁸

In our poem this previously broadly developed motif is treated rather briefly. Among the make-up arts Propertius only mentions the non-Roman habit of dying the hair that had been adopted from the women of the northern barbarians. He personally likes Cynthia best in her natural beauty, for him she is beautiful when she loves him.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ This kind of threatening reference to future old age when love is no longer possible is a common topos of erotic poetry: Theog. 1303f.; 1305f.; *A.P.* 12.30–32; Hor. *C.* 4.10 etc. See Cairns (1972) 85f.

¹²⁸ See Lyne (1980) 104–107.

¹²⁹ If the traditional verse sequence is maintained, the conjecture *desine, mi* by Baehrens in line 29 is the best solution. See Giardina and Goidl.

In line 33f. he moves on to a new thought: In order to stress the selflessness and solicitude of his love Catullus had said in his 72nd poem he had loved Lesbia as a father loves his sons and sons-in-law. Like him Propertius here assures his beloved he wants to be like a brother or son to her, stressing thereby that he wants to be her loyal protector.¹³⁰ In other words, he does not want to experience just the erotic pleasures of love; his love also wants to express itself as affection for her whole person. It is this kind of love, too, that speaks in the last two distiches where, returning to the motif of the beginning, he begs her not to try and impress by wearing flashy jewelry, which would make her the object of defamatory gossip.

Nineteenth elegy

Possibly in search of a variation he takes up one of Tibullus's motifs. For Tibullus the country is where he wants to live in his elegies 1.1 and 1.5. There, far from the luxuries of the city and the noise of war lovers can be happy. The world of the farmers as a place where the old virtues of ancient times have been preserved appears to him the very opposite to present-day Rome.

In line 1 Propertius addresses the beloved. While regretting her departure he is pleased she is going to a remote country district. The reason for his pleasure is given in lines 3, 5, and 9 in three cola introduced by *nullus*, *nulla*, *nulli* respectively: in the country there is no erotic temptation. Entirely at one with Tibullus he contrasts the depraved life of the city with the uncorrupted life in the country where Cynthia is now going to live. He even goes into details about the lonely mountains, the herds and the simple work of the farmer like ploughing and pruning the vines. There Cynthia will be sacrificing incense in a rural temple and attempt a rustic dance in honour of a god. The fact that Propertius knows this part of the country very well only emerges in line 25f.: It is the remote stretch of the Umbrian countryside by the Clitumnus where he had grown up.

In line 17 Propertius decides to seek out this part of the country himself. There he wants to be a huntsman, that is why he wants to

¹³⁰ In a similar vein of affectionate solicitude he had already said in 1.11.21 that he wanted to care for her as he would for his mother; Cynthia is for him what the family is for others.

make a sacrifice to Diana and a vow to Venus:¹³¹ To the Goddess of love because he hopes he will enjoy Cynthia's love there, and to the Goddess of the hunt because he wants to follow her practices. He imagines how he would fix the antlers of his prey to a pine tree at the end of a successful hunt and urge on the fiery hounds himself.¹³² But then he realizes he is not quite the right man for this kind of pursuit. Satirizing himself by exaggerating the dangers he calls himself back from his reverie. A lion or wild boar hunt is not for him. He has only enough courage to catch hares and birds, he jokes about himself.

Toward the end of the poem his fears take over again. Even in line 16 he had expressed the hope no stranger would steal into a rustic festivity. Then he admonishes Cynthia in line 27 not to seek adventures and to remember that he would soon be visiting her. And despite the seclusion of this part of the country with its woodland and springs he fears even there a seducer might make use of his absence.¹³³ The final motif looks back to the beginning when Propertius was pleased that the dangers of the city would not threaten Cynthia in the country; now he is afraid of dangers to her even there in the country.

Twentieth elegy

At the beginning of the poem the usual attitude of the two lovers seems to be reversed. It is not Propertius who is complaining that his beloved is unfaithful to him, but Cynthia¹³⁴ accuses Propertius of

¹³¹ Enk ad 17–18 defends the tradition of *Veneri*, Butler-Barber ad 18 prefer *Veneris* and read *ponere vota* as 'give up the veneration of Venus'. It would be strange, though, for Propertius to want nothing more to do with Venus while following Cynthia to the country because of his love for her.

¹³² Perhaps Propertius here takes up a motif of Gallus transmitted by Virgil in *Ecl.* 10.56–60. But while Virgil's Gallus wants to deaden the torment of his love in the violence of the hunt, Propertius simply wants to be close to his beloved, who is staying in the country by going there to hunt. See Cairns (1972) 238f.

¹³³ F. H. Sandbach, *CQ* 55 (1962) 263 and Camps ad 29.31 explain Jacob's attractive conjecture *metuam* in l. 31 as Propertius being afraid that a rival was constantly calling for Cynthia. Wistrand (1977) 58–60 explains that Propertius was afraid that Cynthia's name would appear in the town gossip, i.e., that rumors of her amorous adventures in the country would be spreading in town.

¹³⁴ The name is not actually mentioned, but the six-months-old town gossip (21f.) can only refer to the publication of the first book of the elegies, which focuses on the

betrayal and disloyalty and has written him imploring letters as we are told in line 33. The poem is the assumed answer to these letters.

The first lines begin on a note of high pathos. Even from the point of view of language alone the four questions directed to Cynthia with the anaphorically repeated *quid* followed by *non tam, nec tantum* set a high tone, but the mythological comparisons, above all, are examples expressing the most extreme suffering. The lamentations of Briseis and Andromache are those of two women helplessly taken away as booty. Even worse is the wailing of Philomena and Niobe as they mourn their murdered children. The Sophoclean Electra did not find stronger comparisons in the extremes of grief for her father.¹³⁵ Such pathos must seem a gross exaggeration in this situation. The gap between its cause and its extent is staggering. Clearly the poet expects such a depiction of an outburst of pain and suffering to make the absurdity of such emotional excess obvious and to lead to a calmer response.¹³⁶

But even the following protestations of his own fidelity in lines 9–12 are still couched in the overemotional tones of the beginning, with the poet vowing he would break down all obstacles to reach her, even if he were put in chains or his beloved were locked into a tower as Danae had once been. Then the poem becomes calmer and more serious. He would never believe any slander of Cynthia and, therefore, she, too, should never doubt his love. He swears by everything that is sacred to him that he will be faithful to her to the death and even wants to die together with her.

In the next section, too, in lines 19–28, the tone remains serious. Propertius speaks of the reasons for his unswerving fidelity. It is her kindness (*servitium mite*) rather than her celebrated beauty that attracts him to her. Since she has become famous through his poems she has frequently opened her heart and her door to him. He never had to buy her love with lavish gifts. She has always given herself freely. While many courted her she had chosen him. So he has to be eternally grateful for her affection.

love of Propertius and Cynthia. Cynthia expresses similar accusations of unfaithfulness also in 3.6.19–34 and 4.7.70.

¹³⁵ Soph. *El.* 145–152.

¹³⁶ Lyne (1980) 121f. regards the exaggerations as a humorous adjustment. The continuous changes between different levels of style are noted by La Penna (1977) 116.

Having made this declaration of love without reservations in such plain language the poet then returns once more to the highly emotional tone of the poem's beginning. He calls all the punishments of hell down upon himself if he were ever to forget this gratitude (lines 29–32). But then he closes the poem calmly, asking the beloved not to write such letters full of passionate complaints. He repeats that his fidelity will last for the rest of his life. The same law that applies to genuine friendship for him also applies to his love: One ought not to enter into it blindly, but then one ought not to let go of it.¹³⁷ This conclusion of the poem is clearly a reflection of the Catullan theme that love ought to resemble the bonds of friendship.¹³⁸

Twenty-first elegy

A very different picture of the beloved emerges from this next short poem; yet, it is again Cynthia as the end of the poem suggests. The first distich begins with curses on a rival who had told the beloved slanderous tales about Propertius and thereby gained her favor.¹³⁹ He had, however, left her soon afterward and had married another woman. Apparently it would not have been difficult to see through this man. Propertius had predicted how it would end, but the beloved had not listened to him. Instead she had trusted that man and allowed herself to be beguiled (lines 1–6).

Unmoved—indeed, almost with relish—Propertius now blames the forsaken girl for her folly. The man she had preferred to him was now gloating and ridiculing her together with his wife.¹⁴⁰ He was showing off with his conquest and claimed he had never been particularly interested in her and often kept her waiting in vain. Two mythological examples are meant to show¹⁴¹ that this kind of careless behavior is normal among men, and girls should not believe their promises so rashly (lines 7–16).

¹³⁷ Cicero emphasizes several times that the choice of a friend requires care and maintaining a friendship constancy; see Cic. *Lael.* 32, 62, 65, 78.

¹³⁸ Cat. 109.6.

¹³⁹ The mythical name Panthus may be meant to show that this name is fictitious like the equivalent Demophoon in the next poem.

¹⁴⁰ *Inter eos* can only refer to this, since nobody else has been mentioned. Comparable is 2.9.21f. See Enk 181.

¹⁴¹ 1.15.9–14 suggest that Propertius probably knew a Hellenistic work that depicts the love and pains of love experienced by Calypso.

Sensible advice of this kind does not, however, seem to fall on fertile ground in Cynthia's case. To our surprise we hear that she has learned nothing from her adventure and is now looking for another lover from whom she expects more constancy (text: *qui restet*). One is equally surprised when Propertius assures her in the final distich that he will remain faithful to his beloved forever and whatever the circumstances despite her continued infidelity. The poem appears to be intended to throw light on the unaccountable and irrational ways of love as such, as Horace did in his ode to Tibullus (1.33). However, in contrast to Horace Propertius shows a possible way out of the emotional turmoil by emphasizing his own constant fidelity in the last distich.

Twenty-second elegy

In this poem Propertius presents himself as a carefree Don Juan who is equally enchanted by each and every girl. In other words, he here depicts his attitude as the exact opposite of what he has previously shown as his basic outlook in his relationship with Cynthia. For instance, in elegy 1.4 he had firmly replied to his friend Bassus, who advised him to enjoy lighthearted and frequently changing relationships that he wanted to remain without fail the faithful slave of his one and only mistress.

In the first distich the poet addresses a friend named Demophoon, who had observed on the previous day how Propertius delighted equally in many girls. The whole scene and the friend are presumably invented to create a lively situation as a starting point. The poet agrees in lines 3–12: In the streets and especially in the theatres of Rome his senses are captivated by ever new charms, in the theatre appearing on the stage, but even more displayed by the girls in the audience. But when one of them turned her eyes away from him in a rebuff he had been inconsolable (line 11f.).¹⁴² When the friend now wonders (lines 13ff.) why he is so indiscriminately at the mercy of all female charms his only answer is that there is no such thing as 'why' in love. Love, he says, is his obsession, no different

¹⁴² In line 11f. the transition into past tenses provides a difficulty. Perhaps the preceding present tenses indicate that this is how it always is with him, while line 11f. refers to the previous day (*here*) when his friend was present.

from the strange enthusiasms others have. He is completely unable to keep his eyes off the beauties around him.

In the next group of lines, 21–34, he counters the familiar elegiac image of the pale lover, his health sapped by his passion, with which he had wholly identified in the first book.¹⁴³ Love had never sapped his strength, he claims, playfully comparing himself to such mythological figures as Jupiter, Achilles, and Hector whose vigor was also undiminished by love. From line 35 he continues his lighthearted philosophy with a comparison from nature and praises the advantage of having two girlfriends at the same time: If one does not feel like it, the other one will give him comfort. When he then refers to the proverbial turn of phrase that two ropes are better for making fast a ship than one,¹⁴⁴ the banality of the comparison gives his statement an almost frivolous character.

Lines 43ff. fit in well with this frivolous tone although their connection with the preceding verses has often been doubted. When Propertius here suddenly addresses a girl and invites her, this does not indicate a change in the poetic situation. This is simply a device he frequently uses to give his language a lively turn. A girl should give him a clear answer whether she wants to come or not. If she declines he will ask another one as he said above. What he can't stand is an acceptance which is then withdrawn. The role of the sighing and longing, abandoned lover is not for him, he declares.¹⁴⁵ Propertius could not have expressed the contrast to his usual stance more clearly.

Ovid appears to have liked our elegy exceedingly well. In the first book of the *Ars*, lines 55–100, he mentions all the streets, squares, and theatres of the capital where one could admire the charms of the Roman girls and make their acquaintance. In *Amores* 2.10 he admits like Propertius in this poem¹⁴⁶ that he took delight in having two mistresses at once and that he was enchanted by their contrasting charms. He, too, believes himself unable to live without love

¹⁴³ See 1.1.22; 1.5.21f.

¹⁴⁴ See Otto (1890) s.v. *duo* No 3.

¹⁴⁵ In l. 48 Barber and Giardina propose *cum . . . venerit* as the most meaningful correction. Shackleton Bailey (1956) 289 compares *A.P.* 12.201 and suggests that the reading *dicere* or Bachrens's conjecture *promere* in l. 50 would make the text comprehensible.

¹⁴⁶ La Penna (1951) 11 points out Ovid's adoption of this subject.

and, despite his delicate constitution, certainly not to be lacking in vigor for loving. In contrast to Ovid, however, this poem's excursion into a frivolous attitude to love is not typical of Propertius. It would probably not be too wrong to assume that the reason for this choice of topic lay in his desire to explore a new approach to love poetry.¹⁴⁷

Twenty-third elegy and twenty-fourth elegy, lines 1–16

Considering the existing uncertainties about the divisions between these elegies, the thematic coherence must have the final say. In 24.17ff. a new topic undoubtedly begins. Here the poet reproaches Cynthia bitterly for having found a new lover after only a few days of shared love. In 23 and 24.1–16 the topic is an entirely different one. There Propertius talks to a friend whom he allows to make a comment in 24.1. To him he explains that he much prefers the love of courtesans (lines 23.1f., 22f. 24.9f.). As a reason he first introduces a traditional topos in 23.3–20: A relationship with a Roman lady involves immense difficulties compared with the love of courtesans. After an astonished interjection by his friend he then, in 24.3–8, brings up the equally problematical relationship with Cynthia, which has earned him a bad reputation in the entire city of Rome. To this he contrasts again the uncomplicated love of girls of easy virtue. Lines 11–16 remain in this context. The topic of gifts refers back to line 8. From the thematic point of view lines 23 and 24.1–16 appear, therefore, to belong to a single homogenous textual complex as already noted by Scaliger.

In the first distich Propertius explains his change of mind with images from one of Callimachus' epigrams.¹⁴⁸ Callimachus had once compared his preference for the small, subtle poem to his avoidance of the crowded main road and the common boy as well as the public well. Distinguishing between past and present Propertius declares, once he wanted to avoid the roads of the milling crowds, but now he likes drinking from the public well, pointing ahead, of course, to the street walkers.

¹⁴⁷ Camps 151 sees this as documentation for a change in his love life, while Reitzenstein (1936) 51 suspects the reflection of a momentary mood.

¹⁴⁸ Call. *Ep.* 28 Pf. = *A.P.* 12.43; similar also *Ep.* 31.5 Pf. = *A.P.* 12.102.

Lines 3–20 describe, still without referring to Cynthia,¹⁴⁹ what difficulties face the lover (*ingenuus quisquam*) of the well-guarded and demanding ladies of Rome and how simple it is to find a girl of easy virtue. Propertius here takes up a very common theme; all his main motifs are already present in Horace's Satire 1.2. Here, too, we find the slaves on guard, the embarrassing circumstances, the rarity of the granted favor, the closed door, the squandering of the paternal wealth, and the fear of the husband's return from the country. Only the arguments with the slaves are treated in greater detail by Propertius. Horace had also already described in a similar vein how easy it is to deal with courtesans by comparison. Here, too, the minimal amount of clothing leaves little of the physical attractions to the imagination, there is no worry about guards or fear to be turned away and only modest gifts are required.¹⁵⁰

In this section of the poem praising carefree love Propertius does not yet refer to the particular problems arising from his relationship with Cynthia. In line 21f., when he longs for a similarly uncomplicated relationship, it is still not Cynthia who is on his mind; for *furta pudici tori* can surely only mean a secret relationship with a matron. Line 23f. does, at least, offer a degree of transition to the following lines. His description of passionate love as a loss of freedom could certainly fit all kinds of relationships, but applies particularly well to his relationship with Cynthia, which Propertius has depicted often enough as a slavelike dependence on his 'mistress'.

Line 24.1 follows on smoothly from the preceding praise of the love of women of easy virtue.¹⁵¹ The friend asks Propertius in surprise how he could say these things, while his book Cynthia¹⁵² was the topic of conversation in the whole of Rome, in other words, that the extremes of his passionate love for a single mistress were well known. This question takes us from the traditional motif with which the poem had begun to Propertius' personal problem. His problem

¹⁴⁹ The following are not really appropriate to the situation of Cynthia and Propertius: line 3 *alterius* . . . *servo* by which only the husband's slave can be meant, line 9 *vultum custodis amari*, line 10 *captus* etc., line 18 *strictus* . . . *pater*, line 20 *vir* . . . *mihi rure venit*. See Williams (1968) 530.

¹⁵⁰ Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.37–134; see already Cercidas fr. 5.27–32 Powell. For the dialogue with the brief exchanges *A.P.* 5.46 (Philodemus) provides something comparable.

¹⁵¹ See Enk 306; differently Günther (1997a) 17 n. 54.

¹⁵² The first book of elegies had previously carried the title Cynthia; see Enk (1946) 1.177 who refers to Mart. 14.189 for this title.

is not what assails the lover of a Roman lady externally like all those obstacles mentioned above, but the internal, emotional stress the relationship with Cynthia had plunged him into. Propertius answers that he must be ashamed; a good name was not reconcilable with a love affair of this kind.¹⁵³ However, it was also Cynthia's fault that he had such an appalling reputation. If she had received him as pleasantly as the courtesans, their relationship would not have become the talk of the town.¹⁵⁴ The chosen pseudonym¹⁵⁵ would have protected him. In the present situation it was hardly surprising that he was seeking his pleasure with ladies of easy virtue; that, at least, was bringing not as much disgrace on him as his relationship with her.

The transition after verse 10 is abrupt. Consequently Baehrens considered the possibility of a gap in the text. However, thematically the final piece definitely joins on to the preceding part. As the Roman ladies expected valuable gifts from her lovers in the first part, here Cynthia wants all kinds of luxury objects and cheap baubles. Propertius would not mind that so much if she did not make him the butt of everybody's jokes because of her treacherous behavior.

Twenty-fourth elegy, lines 17–52

Here in this elegy Propertius employs variations of motifs he has developed elsewhere. Like here he had previously complained to Cynthia about her frivolity and her infidelity in 1.15, and as early as 1.5 he knew that his love would cause him pain and suffering. In other poems (1.19; 2.1.56; 2.13) he had expressed the hope that Cynthia would bury him one day and mourn him, and in 2.20 he had almost solemnly emphasized that his love would last until his death. With the return to so many motifs he had used previously in

¹⁵³ In line 24.4 the textual proposal by Baehrens *aut pudor ingenuis aut retinendus amor*, which is defended by Shackleton Bailey (1956) 112, makes good sense. In Ov. Her. 15.121 *amor* and *pudor* are juxtaposed similarly irreconcilably.

¹⁵⁴ Propertius' love affair is in the eyes of Romans with traditional attitudes *nequitia* (2.4.6) because it conflicts entirely with the traditional way of life; see 1.6.25; 2.3.4. That it has made him the talk of the town is also mentioned in 3.25.1f. See also Hor. *Epo.* 11.7f.

¹⁵⁵ This is how Enk ad 8 explains it, but the tradition may be corrupt here. Housman assumes *non bene* instead of *nomine*.

other poems there seems hardly any justification for doubting that it is, indeed, Cynthia who is addressed here.¹⁵⁶

The first distichs outline the situation. The beloved addressed here by the agitated poet with urgent questions had read his poems with admiration and promised him nights of pleasure; but after only a few such nights she has grown weary of him and transferred her love to another lover (lines 17–22). In an emotional outburst in lines 23ff. he challenges this man to match his own achievements in his art and to take similarly Herculean labors upon himself. The comparison with the hard struggles of Heracles here as well as further along appears out of place. On the other hand, it was a common topos of erotic poetry as Plautus's *Persa* suggests,¹⁵⁷ and Propertius likes comparisons of this kind. In elegy 1.1 he had similarly chosen the battles and wounds of the mythological Milanion in the Arcadian desert as a comparison for the wounds inflicted on his soul in the battles for his love. Important, too, is the motif in line 24 which he develops later: The opponent should like him serve a single love. Propertius is convinced that his rival cannot fulfill this demand and in a year's time the relationship will come to an end. His own love, on the other hand, he declares in line 33f., would not cease even after an infinitely large number of years, nor after pains like those suffered by Heracles, nor, indeed at his death. Hence his attempts to escape from it in 2.22 and 2.23 are firmly pushed aside here.

In lines 35–38 Propertius is convinced that Cynthia will recognize his loyalty, albeit not before his funeral when she is faced with his ashes. If she will then describe him as not very rich and not of noble birth, these must have been attributes of which his rival was proud. Then Propertius returns to his protestations: He would bear everything, and no infidelity of the beloved¹⁵⁸ would induce him to renounce her; putting up with her moods he does not consider a burden. He contrasts his loyalty with that of various figures of Greek mythology: not one, he claims, could rival him in fidelity.

But then lines 47ff. recapitulate the motifs from the beginning of the poem. The poet laments the fact that a woman can be so lacking

¹⁵⁶ Camps 166 believes Propertius is addressing a new acquaintance.

¹⁵⁷ Plautus *Pers.* 1–5 as pointed out by Leo (1912) 151.

¹⁵⁸ On *iniuria* in this meaning, see Pichon (1902; 1999) s.v. *iniuria*.

in fidelity and warns not to trust wealthy and noble admirers,¹⁵⁹ as they are never faithful. He expresses this through the funeral motif he had touched on above: They would not come to her funeral, but he would. Correcting himself quickly he adds a nice final remark: He hoped, of course, that he would die before her and she would mourn him. After the loud protestations filling the middle of the poem these thoughts of death to which his faithful love would persist, the poem ends on a calm and sensitive note.

Twenty-fifth elegy

From elegy 1.1 on Propertius has repeatedly thought deeply about his love for Cynthia which he regarded as his fate. Our elegy, too, wants to illuminate essential aspects of this love. Its conflicting nature is addressed already in the first verse: the beloved is for him the only one and the most beautiful of women, but she was born to inflict pain on him. The second line defines the reason for the pain: the beloved withdraws from him again and again. Another essential aspect is expressed in the second distich: the beloved is the center of his poetry; her beauty will be as widely celebrated as the beauty of the lovers of such famous love poets as Catullus and Calvus.

In the following Propertius unfolds the themes of the absolute devotion as well as the painfulness of love. These statements are framed by diverse series of examples. In the first one in lines 5–8 he demonstrates in the manner of a law of nature that everything on earth fades and passes. In line 9f. he contrasts this with great certainty with the claim that the years, no matter how many, could not diminish his love. The other aspect of his love is dealt with in lines 11–20. The poet asks in a further series of examples whether it might not have been easier to suffer the worst possible physical torture. With the torture inside the brazen bull of Phalaris, the gaze of the Gorgon that changes its victim to stone, the agony of Prometheus having his liver consumed he names the most terrifying torments imaginable. This is how Propertius wants the torments his soul suffers

¹⁵⁹ Probably because of the abrupt transition after line 56, Rossberg suggested shifting the distich line 47f. to line 22. However, the thematic continuity of line 48 in line 49 supports the decision to keep the transmitted sequence; but see Günther (1997a) 49.

to be seen. Exaggerations like these are not exactly untypical for him. To make his meaning clear he likes to resort to strong words. One only has to remember the equally extravagant comparison with the sufferings of Heracles in the previous elegy. However, in line 15 he says very succinctly: Whatever hardship his love may inflict on him he is determined to bear it. This he demonstrates with the examples in line 15f.: Even iron and stones are ground down or hollowed out, but his love cannot be diminished by the worst treatment he receives from his mistress. In the following verses the words *nullo . . . sub crimine*,¹⁶⁰ *minas*, *contemptus*, and *laesus* convey very graphically the ill treatment he endures. Nevertheless he is prepared to suffer all reproaches with humility and take the blame for any quarrels.

This almost slavish submission under the will of the 'mistress' is a reversal of the commonly practiced social norms of Rome. Catullus had set the first example of this role of the lover in the central Carmen 68.135–140 when he projected himself in a provocative gender reversal into the role of Juno, who had to submit to the infidelities of her husband. For the elegists this subordination becomes the staple role in their love relationships.¹⁶¹

With the words *tu quoque* in line 21 and *at vos* in line 39 Propertius addresses people who have a different view of love. The first one is a man who in the rapturous happiness of his love believes it will last forever. This Propertius considers an illusion: in his view no woman is constant. Again with the help of a number of examples, this time from seafaring and chariot racing, he explains that one should not be sure of one's success too soon. As in life, he suggests, in love too the later the shipwreck occurs, the worse it tends to be. Therefore, he advises those who are too sure of themselves¹⁶² to be cautious and tread carefully in order to hang on to their happiness

¹⁶⁰ The conjecture by Langermann for line 17 is preferred by Barber, Camps, and Giardina. Instead of the strange *nullo sub . . . limine* (behind how many *limina* does the beloved hide?) one expects a parallel concept to the following *minas* etc.

¹⁶¹ This way of characterizing love relationships common among the elegists appears in places like the following: Gallus: The Papyrus, l. 7, then Prop. 1.4.4; 1.5.19f.; 1.7.5–8; 1.17.15f.; 2.4.1ff.; 2.13.36; 3.25.3; Tib. 1.5.29f.; 2.4.1–4; [Tib.] 3.4.73f. See Pichon (1902; 1991) s.v. *domina; servire*; F. O. Copley, TAPhA 78 (1947) 285–300; Boucher (1965) 91; Lyne (1979) 117–30.

¹⁶² Propertius had already shown himself in the pose of the man who is experienced in love and can give advice to others in 1.1.35–38 and 1.9.1–8.

for a short time, at least. In lines 35–38 this part of the poem closes with the resigned conclusion that a lasting and happy love relationship was only possible in old and purer times;¹⁶³ but he still wants to adhere to his ideal of love, even in the much changed present.

In lines 39ff. he discusses the attitude to love common among his contemporaries who, like his friend Bassus in elegy 1.4, prefer frequently changing love affairs to a permanent relationship like the one Propertius treasures. Repeating *vidistis* four times he presents the charms that ravish such people, but, he comments soberly, every new one brings new heartache (line 40).¹⁶⁴ Just one woman alone causes enough sleepless nights (line 46), he declares.

By looking at attitudes to love which are different from his own, albeit with a skeptical eye, the contemplation of his own love turns into something like a philosophy of love in this elegy.

Twenty-six elegy

Similar to other elegies of the second book, Propertius here modifies the motifs of the first book. In Elegy 1.8 he complained in the manner of Propempticon,¹⁶⁵ or possibly in emulation of the first elegiac poet Gallus,¹⁶⁶ that Cynthia was leaving him and would be following a wealthy suitor across the sea. He reminds her of the dangers of the sea, but then becomes conciliatory and wishes her happiness on her journey no matter what she was doing to him and assures her she would always be his. In the second part of the poem Propertius then is full of jubilation because Cynthia has forgone the journey and declined the temptations of wealth in order to stay with him.

In our elegy the poet tells the beloved a dream he has had. He sees her drifting helplessly in the Ionian Sea after a shipwreck and is dreadfully worried about her. A dream before a journey is considered

¹⁶³ Such an ideal is depicted in 3.13.25–46.

¹⁶⁴ Text with Giardina and Fedeli: *quantus sic . . . nostra*. See Rothstein ad 39.

¹⁶⁵ Macleod (1983) 196–201 shows the similarity between the motifs of 1.8 and 2.26 and the motifs of Propempticon, making it easier thereby to understand the individual motifs and the unity of the two elegies. Papangelis (1987) 94, 96f. sees a change to a more distanced account when comparing 1.8.27ff. and 2.26.21–26.

¹⁶⁶ This is suggested above all by the similarity between Verg. *Ecl.* 10.46–49 and Prop. 1.8.7f.

a good or bad omen. By telling Cynthia this anxiety dream Propertius must want it to be seen as an urgent warning not to undertake an intended journey. So we have here the same basic situation as in 1.8, even the same route across the Ionian Sea. The difference is that what before was only a warning of what might happen, becomes in his dream the reality of a catastrophe that has occurred. The fact that Cynthia in her fear of death accuses herself of infidelity and calls desperately for the lover she has deserted also serves to underline the reference to the same situation.¹⁶⁷

The dream is, however, not only a warning; it also flatters the beloved, and in his anxiety for her the poet also shows his love. Like in elegy 2.28 where he imagines the beloved whom he deems close to death as placed among the beautiful heroines of ancient times, he sees her here transported among the sea goddesses where she is the greatest beauty.¹⁶⁸ The splendor of the mythical world is conjured up through the magical vowel sounds of the Greek names, while the poet's love is reflected in his anxious entreaties directed to all the helpful gods of the sea. And when he sees the dolphin swimming toward her—presumably sent by these gods to help her¹⁶⁹—he does not want to hang back but throw himself off the high cliff into the sea to go to the aid of the drowning beloved. When his fear is at its greatest he wakes up.

As before in elegy 1.8 the change from anxiety to exultation occurs very suddenly. Even in the earlier elegy the beloved's change of mind was not narrated directly but became clear from the poet's reaction. Words like "she stays", "we have won", "she has listened to my unceasing imploring" did, however, point definitely to the initial situation. In our poem we are not told either how the poet's warnings and remonstrations brought about a change of mind, and since the travel plans are only implied and can only be guessed at, the change is even more surprising. But the same feeling of triumph and the same submission of the beloved to the poet, the same amazement

¹⁶⁷ While in 1.8 the poet reproaches her, she now reproaches herself in line 3. In terms of motifs line 12 can be compared to Verg. *A.* 4.383f. where Dido anticipates that Aeneas having left her would call out her name full of remorse when he is shipwrecked.

¹⁶⁸ See Reitzenstein (1936) 38f. for lines 13–16.

¹⁶⁹ This idea comes from Hertzberg ad 11.

about his own power, show that Propertius here deliberately refers back to the earlier text.¹⁷⁰

The following lines 23–28, too, with their juxtaposition of the temptation of wealth and the power of poetry that the beloved prefers so firmly,¹⁷¹ only make sense if the temptation of wealth has played a part before—that is, in a situation like the one depicted in 1.8. Nevertheless, the discontinuous transition is still very abrupt. It appears not to be the poet's main aim to create a contextual situation but to convey emotions through intensely experienced moments.

In line 29 the elegy again takes an unexpected turn,¹⁷² which surprises the reader after the warning to Cynthia not to undertake the sea journey that is implied by the dream narrative. It is, however, entirely consistent with the love expressed therein and the gratitude he feels for the affection shown by the beloved. Line 29 shows the poet prepared to follow the beloved if she wants to cross the sea. They are going to be together then as a faithful couple. This togetherness is underlined by the frequent repetition of *unus*: On one coast, under one tree, by one spring, on one ship's plank the lovers will be united. If only his beloved is with him the poet is prepared to face the dangers and the storms of the sea that are described in the old myths. What terrified him in his dream Propertius is now willing to endure. And if Jupiter's lightening strikes the boat and they are shipwrecked he is prepared to die, if only they are together when it happens. Rarely has Propertius celebrated as convincingly as in this fantasy the happiness of two people united in a love that in this way was unachievable in the reality of Roman life.¹⁷³

In the part of the poem containing lines 45–58 the poem then becomes calmer. The poet can't believe that the gods of the sea and the wind gods who have experienced love themselves will not show

¹⁷⁰ Macleod (1983) 198 points out the similarity of the motifs in *vicinus/serviat* and *rumphantur/nunc admirentur* (1.8.27f. and 2.26.21f.).

¹⁷¹ Rothstein understands line 28 as a doubt-filled question. This continues the juxtaposition from before: *fides* and *constantia* in verse 27 match the faithful lover. This is contrasted in line 28 with the wealthy suitor who can give rich gifts but whose love is doubtful. The *multum et amare* suggested by Heinsius would, however, be linguistically smoother.

¹⁷² *Seu* in line 29 is explained by Enk ad 28 as *vel si*, “even if”, “and if”, like in Tib. 1.6.21. The exclamation *heu* does not fit in with the following text.

¹⁷³ See Alfonsi (1945) 45.

mercy to such a love.¹⁷⁴ From the point of view of the motif this links up well with the hope for divine help expressed in the dream image. So Propertius now hopes and trusts that the bright stars in a cloudless sky will guide them. He does, however, once more confirm in the final distich that he is prepared to face death together with her.

Twenty-seventh elegy

When he uses the word *mortales* in the first distich Propertius addresses not so much his readers as humanity as a whole. By adding *sequimur* and *flemus*¹⁷⁵ and thereby including himself in lines 5 and 7 he modifies the address slightly, but basically it is still the human race he means. Lines 1–10 describe its fears. Uncertainty is its fate since human beings don't know when and how death is going to strike them down. Anxiously they ask the stars and bemoan, especially in wartime, the dangers threatening them. But even in peacetime they worry about possible threat from fires, collapsing houses, and poison.

This expansive depiction of the existential dreads of humanity is not introduced for its own sake but serves as a foil to the very different attitude of lovers. With great certainty the poet claims in line 11 that the lover is free from such common fears; he knows the hour and cause of his death, the implication being, presumably, that he will die when his beloved dies or leaves him. But that is not how he expresses it. Propertius ends his poem in a more poetic manner. In prose the conclusion would probably say that the lover would return to life even from the edge of the grave, if he were called back by his beloved. The poet expresses this by imagining himself already sitting by the bank of the river of the dead and seeing Charon's boat approach, when his beloved's soft voice reaches his ear and calls him back to life. In Propertius' concept of love as absolute and limitless, death loses its power. Similarly he had already asserted in elegy 1.19.12 that death is no barrier for a great love. The question of reality has little meaning in his view of love. The world of his love extends beyond place and time.

¹⁷⁴ Elsewhere too lovers remind the gods of the sea and the winds reproachfully of their own love, as in 1.17.25–28. A probable origin of this motif is considered by Papangelis (1987) 103–108.

¹⁷⁵ In line 7 the traditional *flemus* is preferable to Housman's conjecture *fles tu*. After *sequimur* the change of subject would be very abrupt. See Camps ad 10.

The elegy has an almost epigrammatic character. It is not only its brevity that gives this impression but also the fact that the last two distichs are so firmly directed toward their poetic goal. On the other hand, the first part of the poem is sufficiently elaborate to prevent its designation as an epigram.¹⁷⁶

Twenty-eighth elegy

There is no agreement about the homogeneity and the coherence of this elegy. In the Neapolitanus line 35 is marked as the beginning of a new poem, and many editors since Hertzberg have divided up the text even into three or four parts. The reason is understandable. While the overall topic is the fact that Cynthia has fallen dangerously ill, there is no unity of situational structure. In lines 1ff. the poet implores Jupiter to take pity on the sick beloved. In lines 35ff. the illness has worsened: Magic rites have failed, and bad omens indicate disaster. The poet is determined to die with Cynthia and repeats in even more passionate tones his entreaty to Jupiter now to take pity on both of them. In lines 47ff. the acute danger seems to have passed and he begs other gods to continue to show kindness. In the last two distiches the danger is finally over, and he asks Cynthia to be grateful for her deliverance.

In the course of the whole elegy the poet moves between imploring the gods, addressing Cynthia, and reflecting. It is really only in lines 35–38 that we are given a description of external events. The poem has, as I have mentioned before, a single unified topic but not a single unified situation. This kind of disjunctive poetic composition is, however, one possible form of Hellenistic poetry, as Wilamowitz noted:¹⁷⁷ The twenty-fifth Idyll of the Theocritean corpus brings three disconnected separate episodes of a Heracleian adventure in which essential parts of the action are omitted.

¹⁷⁶ This assessment is by Wilamowitz (1924) 1.234.

¹⁷⁷ Wilamowitz (1924) 1.235.1. R. E. White, *TAPhA* 89 (1958) 245–62, sees 2.28 as a sequence of scenes as in a play. Cairns (1972) 153–57 compares the poems to related motifs in [Tib.] 3.10 and Ov. *Am.* 2.13. [Tib.] 3.10 on the occasion of Sulpicia's illness moves similarly from the plea for help to a healing god (1–10) through the lover's anxious efforts (11–14) to recovery (15f.), to the thanks-offering (23f.) and renewed happiness for the lovers (25f.) The author who, of course, knew our elegy, clearly saw it as a single unit. Günther (1997a) 21–25 takes a different view.

In the first lines of the elegy the poet implores Jupiter to have mercy. He claims Jupiter is to blame if Cynthia has to die. Since the cause for the weather was ascribed to the heavenly god, he is responsible for the heat of the dog days, too, which is threatening the patient. In lines 5ff. his thoughts wander. The poet thinks of other possible causes for the danger she is in. It might be Cynthia's own fault for having, like so many beauties, broken her lover's vows or for having set herself above the goddesses in the knowledge of her charms. In line 15 the poet's thoughts take a different turn. He addresses Cynthia in an attempt to comfort her: Mythological examples show that her fate, too, will take a turn for the better. Even in death, he suggests, an enviable lot would be granted to her: She would be assigned the most honorable place among the heroines of ancient Greece. All these different themes revolve around the same basic idea: The goddesses who are jealous of Cynthia's beauty, the four persecuted heroines, the circle in Elysium, they all serve to raise Cynthia above the everyday life of Rome, which is still present in the dog-day heat and the broken vows, and transport her into the poetic world of Greek mythology. This was already the central theme of the second and third elegies of this book where Cynthia's beauty was compared to the beauty of some of the heroines and she was celebrated as one who is very close to the gods. Only the two final distichs of this section of the poem return to the initial situation: He advises the beloved to submit to her fate. Jupiter and even Juno of whose divine anger line 11 had spoken would be merciful, and the harmful heat would abate.

In line 35 the mood changes completely. After the recently expressed hope for divine mercy the poet now fears the worst. Cleansing rites and magic intended to banish the evil that has befallen her have failed, and the croaking of the bird of ill omen threatens with death. The rites that Propertius has tried in vain are described in a similar way by Tibullus also when his beloved has fallen ill (1.5.10–16): the burning of purifying sulphur, magic rhymes, sacred grain, and the swearing of solemn vows. Nemesianus mentions in a comparable context the burning of crackling laurel leaves (4.65).¹⁷⁸ Propertius'

¹⁷⁸ [Tib.] 3.10.9–12 also mentions fragrances (*sapores*), incantations (*cantus*), and vows in the context of efforts against illness. In another context the crackling of burning laurel leaves means an omen promising happiness: Tib. 2.5.81–83. In Teocr. 2.23–26 and Verg. *Ecl.* 8.82f. the burning of laurel leaves serves as a love magic.

use of language still intensifies the alarming nature of the situation. *Deficiunt* and *negat* show that divine help has failed to arrive and the half-burned laurel leaves on the ashes of the extinguished fire give a desolate impression. Finally, the menace conveyed by the bird of ill omen is further emphasized by words like *nigra* and *funestum* . . . *omen*. Now is no longer the time to indulge in pleasant speculations like at the beginning of the poem. Fiercely determined, Propertius declares he wants to die with the beloved. A ship with black sails will take both of them across the waters of the underworld. In his invocations of Jupiter too his tone has changed. He entreats him to grant the two lovers their lives and promises solemnly to compose a thanksgiving poem if the god saves her. The girl too, once she had recovered, would express her gratitude with prayers in the temple.

After this passionate intensification the tone of the poem grows calm again in lines 48–58 and 59–62. When the poet begs Persephone and her husband to continue to show mercy to them, he must already have felt some evidence of this mercy. A certain amount of time must, therefore, have passed and the threat of immediate danger has also receded. When Propertius begs for Cynthia not yet to be placed among the heroines of whom so many are already in Persephone's realm, he mentions again the most famous names from Greek mythology and thereby connects her closely with them. In line 49f. the words *formosarum* and *pulchra* are significantly placed next to each other: Cynthia's beauty places her as an equal among the greatest beauties of all times.

Saved from grave danger Cynthia finally appears in the last two distichs. The fact that she is asked to give thanks to Diana and Isis suggests that she habitually venerates these two goddesses at other times, too.¹⁷⁹ But these two names are also linked with earlier parts of the poem. In line 17f. the poet had used the fate of Io-Isis as a parallel, and in line 37 the moon goddess, one of the forms Diana is believed to take, had still refused her help. There is no need to mention thanks to Jupiter again; they were anticipated in the humble gratitude expressed in line 45f. To the many different shades of tone contained in the elegy the final exuberant last verse adds a high-spirited final chord. Having dedicated ten days to the veneration of Isis in elegy 2.33.1f. she is now expected to dedicate ten

¹⁷⁹ Isis: 2.33.1f.; see also Tib. 1.3.23–26. Diana: 2.32.9f.

nights to the poet to thank him for all his support. Propertius hopes that after the black days of her illness his beloved will bring him delight and happiness again.

Twenty-ninth elegy

Propertius here has transformed motifs from elegy 1.3 into a twinlike companion piece to the first poem, with very similar motifs. In 1.3 he had described how he arrived at Cynthia's house late at night very drunk after a symposium and found her fast asleep. Though fired by passion he longed to approach her and love her, he shrank from disturbing her sleep and so sat for a long time entranced by her beauty until a moonbeam woke her up. Once awake she reproached him with his infidelity and told him plaintively how she had waited for him half the night, now at the loom, now singing to the lyre until sleep had overwhelmed her.

Here, in lines 1–22 the situation of the drunken night owl is playfully transformed into a mythical scene. He encounters a crowd of naked little love gods, an image like those to be found on the friezes in Roman frescoes. His passionate desire in elegy 1.3 has turned into the chains and shackles that the little cupids use to drag him to his beloved. As they come on instruction of his beloved (lines 9, 20), the poet plays with the idea that the mistress has given orders to catch the escaped slave and return him to her. This fits in with the order given in line 22 that he must learn to stay at home—that is, in the house of his mistress.¹⁸⁰ The description of her long wait, which is made by Cynthia herself in 1.3, is here given to one of the cupids (line 13),¹⁸¹ who also portrays her beauty—which in 1.3 Propertius had depicted himself, full of admiration (lines 15–18). Now the tone is very different, though. While Cynthia's beauty was revealed only indirectly in 1.3 through comparisons and through the reaction of the visitor who is transfixed by it as he gazes at her, the little

¹⁸⁰ F. Cairns, *CQ* 65 (1971) 455–60, explains this idea in detail.

¹⁸¹ Line 13 picks up the motive of 1.3.37–44; the reproach in line 14 is reminiscent of 1.3.35f. A literal parallel is to be found at the beginning of lines 1.3.7 and 2.29.29.

Cupid here describes the seductive charms of the beloved, who is waiting for her lover very directly and in unambiguous terms.

From line 29 on the situation is so different that one probably has to see it as an independent poem.¹⁸² While the account of the nighttime encounter is given to Cynthia who is addressed in line 1 immediately after its occurrence (*hesterna nocte!*), the events of the second part are told after an interval of several days (line 42). Also, Cynthia is now spoken of only in the third person (*illa*), and finally the poet no longer comes urged on by his love in the dead of night but in the morning as a suspicious spy wanting to find out whether the beloved has slept alone.

The second part too is different. Like in 1.3 Cynthia is resting on her bed, but here she is already awake. The visitor is no doubt here too entranced by her beauty, but the nature of the description has changed. In 1.3 the scene had a dreamlike atmosphere. The comparison with the slumbering heroines and spellbound Argus watching the sleeping Io from a hundred eyes raises the scene above the level of literal reality and makes us understand why the enchanted lover does not dare touch the beloved. Now we are only told of his amazement at her beauty, and the comparison the poet uses does not rise into the mythical realm but is an image provided by a real memory: As beautiful as at this moment the beloved did not even appear to her lover when, disturbed by dreams and worried about her love, she had visited the temple of Vesta dressed in her most beautiful purple gown in order to consult the priestess. Cynthia's words, too, lead realistically into the actual circumstances of her life. Instead of reproaching the poet in tones of plaintive melancholy she proves she has slept on her own by pointing coldly to the state of her bed and her appearance. She also does not hesitate to speak openly in lines 35–38 of the usual signs that would have been left by a night of love.¹⁸³ The way she refuses a kiss too, by holding her hand in front of her face and leaping out of reach in her light sandals is taken straight from life. To sum up, one might say the earlier elegy was more emotionally charged, whereas the elegy in the second book takes on a more playful character through the phantasmagoria

¹⁸² See Rothstein; Enk 368f. R. E. White, *CP* 59 (1961) 222–25, tries to see 2.29 as a single poem but cannot explain the contradictions in the situations.

¹⁸³ See Shackleton Bailey (1956) 123f. Very similar in tone is Cat. 6.6–14.

of the Cupid swarm; the wealth of realistic touches give the elegy a different character, too.¹⁸⁴

Thirtieth elegy, lines 1–12

F. Cairns and Fedeli propose¹⁸⁵ that the two heterogeneous texts, lines 1–12 and lines 13–40, should be seen as a single poem: they suggest that lines 1–12 are addressed to Cynthia, who has taken the criticism of the strict old people (line 13) to heart and wants to end the relationship. Is this a plausible stance for Cynthia, the carefree woman of the world as depicted by Propertius in all four books? Hardly. The situation in which the poet's words are spoken is more reminiscent of the prologue poem 1.1.3f. where Amor similar to here sits on the neck of the subjugated lover and does not allow him to see properly (line 9f.); they are, therefore, more likely to be addressed to himself, as Plessis points out.

The little elegy of lines 1–12 takes up a motif from Hellenistic poetry that says that nobody can escape Eros.¹⁸⁶ In a late epigram that appears to reuse earlier motifs, the thought is expressed in a very similar way: The beloved might fly to the ends of the earth in the south and the east; her lover would still pursue her, carried along on the wings of Eros.¹⁸⁷ Here Propertius elaborates the motif in a fantastical series of images. He uses myths in which figures like the winged horse, Pegasus; and Perseus; and Hermes, with his winged shoes, were carried through the air and maintains it would be impossible to flee from Eros even with the aid of magical means like these. But once the God has robbed the pursued lover of his freedom and made him his helpless prisoner (lines 7–10) he can also be gracious. If the vanquished lover submits to him and begs for mercy, he often answers his request. So it is that the poem about the all-conquering power of Eros ends in the final distich on a friendly note after all.

¹⁸⁴ Reitzenstein (1936) 46–50 sees the fundamental difference between 29b and 1.3 in the fact that the later elegy is written from a greater distance and, therefore, less emotional. Alfonsi (1945) 39 judges similarly.

¹⁸⁵ F. Cairns, *CQ* 65 (1971) 204f.

¹⁸⁶ [Theocr.] id. 27.20; *A.P.* 5.59 (Archias); see Enk ad 1.

¹⁸⁷ *A.P.* 5.301 (Paulus Silentiarius); see Enk ad 1.2.

Thirtieth elegy, lines 13–40

Just as Propertius contrasts the accepted rules for the traditional Roman way of life to his life dedicated to love, he has in elegies 1.7 and 1.9 already shown the unbridgeable difference between serious epic poetry and light love lyrics. The most emphatic statement of his poetic Credo is to be found in elegy 3.3. Following Callimachus' Prologue to the *Aetia* he gives an account of how Apollo, the god of poetry, had forbidden him to compose epic poetry and instructed him that love poetry was his task and directed him to the grotto of the muses to be shown its characteristic features. It is precisely this contrast that is also the topic of our elegy as F. Cairns shows.¹⁸⁸

The first distichs begin with a Catullan motif. Catullus had asked Lesbia in the fifth poem not to listen to the talk of the stern old men but to live entirely for her love. Similarly, Propertius starts with the words: Let the strict old men be as critical of our feasting as they like; we shall pursue our chosen way of life. Like in 2.15.41f., 2.34.57 and 3.5.21 feasting here stands for a life dedicated to love, and the flute of love played in the course of it¹⁸⁹ implies love poetry. The stern goddess Athene was, according to him, quite wrong to throw away the flute.

In the distich of line 19f. the transmission of the text is disturbed by a corruption. In the Neapolitanus the verb is missing from the sentence.¹⁹⁰ It is likely that a humanist scholar changed the beginning of the sentence to *nunc tu dura paras* in order to make sense of the sentence. It might be better to start the sentence like Scaliger with *num*, to see it as a question and to assume with Camps that the hardly meaningful *nota* should read *nolo* which would give meaning to the sentence. In this way the lines would fit well into the context. They form a contrast to the high-spirited poetry of the feasting:

¹⁸⁸ F. Cairns, *CQ* 65 (1971) 204–13.

¹⁸⁹ The little flute (*tenuis*), with its soft, delicate sound is the instrument Virgil wants to use in *Ecl.* 6.3–8 to accompany his quiet song (*deductum carmen*) which contrasts with the epic poem. The attribute *docta* which Propertius gives to the flute is taken up by him in line 38 with its implications. It points to poetry, especially to that of the Callimachian type. See 2.11.6 with n. 77.

¹⁹⁰ The explanation of the infinitives as so-called infinitives of indignation is very artificial, especially since an accusative is missing; see Enk 381f. on this problem.

Propertius asks, was he not right to refuse to choose warlike topics like the Trojan and Theban myths.¹⁹¹

In lines 23–25 the poet once more refers back to the criticism of his way of life mentioned at the beginning of the poem, juxtaposing it with the ideal of his life and his poetry—namely to live for the one and only beloved. Then he asks Cynthia to accompany him to the grotto of the Muses, which is an image for his poetry. Here, he tells her, the Muses will choose the legends of love from the ancient myths and sing about them. They know, after all, what it is to love. Cynthia will join the choir of the muses directed by the god of poetry Dionysus. Propertius will don the Dionysian ivy wreath and, inspired by the beloved, compose poetry. In this way the poet reiterates his confession of 2.1.4 that the beloved is the true inspiration for his poetry and concludes his glorification of love and love poetry with a significant image.¹⁹²

Thirty-first elegy

This poem was composed on the occasion of the inauguration of the temple precinct of the Palatine Apollo. It is entirely different in character from Horace's Ode 1.31 written for the same occasion. Horace asked Apollo for an attitude of mind that would please the god but would also be Augustan in spirit. Propertius, on the other hand, offers a straightforward description of the valuable works of art that had been brought together there and does not make any reference to their political and religious significance. Augustus had had the temple built, after all, as a very visible demonstration of his victory and of the peaceable piety of his reign.¹⁹³ Propertius indeed took great pleasure elsewhere too in the new splendor of the capital and was very knowledgeable about Greek art.¹⁹⁴ His amazed admiration at the sight of the art treasures displayed there is, therefore, entirely plausible. On the other hand, the fact that, apart from

¹⁹¹ F. Cairns *l.c.* 207f. recognizes that lines 19–22 refer to topics Propertius does not want to write about, such as the expedition of the Argonauts and the Theban myths.

¹⁹² See Lieberg (1963) 124–26.

¹⁹³ On the 'Augustan' meaning of the Palatine Temple of Apollo see Zanker (1987) 90–97.

¹⁹⁴ See 2.32.11–16; 3.9.9–16.

an honorable mention of the imperial master who had instigated the building, he was so entirely deaf to its political message is very striking.¹⁹⁵ It is as if he wanted to stress by his reaction that his poetry is dedicated to the private aspects of life. Later, in the fourth book which has an entirely different mood, in elegy 4.6, he does indeed link the Palatine Temple of Apollo with the political topic of the victory of Actium, and in line 69f. he celebrates Apollo playing the cithara as a sign that the world has become peaceful.

The link to the Cynthia topic is established in the first distich, where Propertius apologizes for his belated arrival with the explanation that he had lingered in astonishment in the newly opened temple precinct. The rest of the poem is taken up by an account of the works of art he had admired there. The poet mentions the extensive courtyard¹⁹⁶ with its pillars of African marble, the statues of the Danaides set between them, the marble statue of the Apollo Citharoedus,¹⁹⁷ the four oxen of Myron surrounding the altar, and the marble temple itself crowned with the chariot of the sun god. He also mentions the great doors with their ivory reliefs and, inside the temple, the cult images: Apollo flanked by Diana and Latona.¹⁹⁸ What is important to him, are the precious materials, the beauty and singularity of the works of art, the famous name of an artist, and how life-like and close to nature the images are. It is the aesthetic qualities alone that he draws attention to.

Thirty-second elegy

In a number of Propertius' elegies it is noticeable that the poet in the course of the poem guides the development of thoughts and emotions to the opposite of those represented at the beginning of the poem. The development of our poem is the opposite one to the

¹⁹⁵ The cult statue in the porticus was quite obviously that of Apollo Actius; see Zanker (1987) ill. 68.

¹⁹⁶ In line 3 the conjecture *in spatium* by Heinsius is probably to be preferred to the transmitted *in speciem*; see Shackleton Bailey (1956) 125.

¹⁹⁷ In line 5 the reading *hic equidem Phoebus* transmitted by some deteriores is worth considering (that is: Here the statue of Apollo appeared to me more beautiful than a living god); see Enk ad 5.

¹⁹⁸ See Zanker (1987) ill. 186. The relief depicts the group of the cult images in the Palatine Temple of Apollo.

thematically related elegy 2.16. There the poet begins by trying to come to terms with an infidelity of the beloved; then the whole pent up, angry disappointment bursts out and sweeps away the self-control of the poem's beginning. Here the poem starts with the poet suspiciously searching for the clearly continuing escapades of the beloved, but then ends with him nevertheless accepting them because this was, after all, the way of the world.

In order to understand the context of the poet's words at the beginning of the poem one may have to consider lines 8 and 17–20 first. The poet cannot accept Cynthia's excuses. He suggests that her constant visits to the country towns around Rome are not caused by her weariness with the metropolis but by her desire to hide her way of life from the poet's eyes. In other words, the section up to line 20 is a response to what Cynthia has said in defense of her conduct.

The clearly mocking statement addressed to Cynthia in the first distich that only he who sees sins, and, consequently, he who does not see her does not desire her, appears to reflect Cynthia's assurances that her frequent trips out of Rome withdraw her from the gaze of others and with that also from their desires, as if those surrounding towns she frequents were the innocent countryside described in 2.19. The searching questions of the next verse reveal the weakness of these excuses. Aren't the places she visits—Praeneste, Tusculum, Tibur and Lanuvium holiday resorts in the nearby hills favored by Roman society? There is no mistaking it, the poet points out. Of course he would not object to Cynthia relaxing on a walk in Lanuvium.¹⁹⁹ But quiet and out of sight it is not, and certainly not if she takes part in a ritual torch run in Aricia near Lanuvium in full view of a densely packed crowd of people. Full of irony the *cum videt* in line 9 refers back to the *qui videt* in line 1: Staying in the country does not by any means remove her from lustful eyes.

Lines 11–16 appear to take up another one of Cynthia's arguments, namely that she was bored with (*sordet!*) the sameness of her surroundings in Rome. The following description of Pompey's colonnade and the adjacent gardens²⁰⁰ then depicts these surroundings in such vivid colors that it is hard to imagine how anyone could be

¹⁹⁹ Rothstein and Camps interpret *hoc loco* in line 7 as a reference to Rome; linguistically more natural would be the place just mentioned.

²⁰⁰ The anonymous epigram *A.P.* 9.823 gives an idea of the unknown fountains.

bored with them. This argument can then be dismissed with ease in lines 17–20: Her boredom with Rome is nothing but pretense, and the excursions outside the city serve no other purpose than Cynthia's adventures, the poet claims. In lines 21–24 his reproach becomes even more outspoken: The Town is full of rumors about her way of life.²⁰¹

In line 25 the tone changes. This change is prepared in line 21 where Propertius had already said that it was not he and his pain that mattered. Now he encourages Cynthia not to worry too much about the tittle-tattle;²⁰² gossip was the fate suffered by all beauties. She had, after all, not committed any crime and he was not too upset about a few little infidelities. He seems to wish to relinquish the suspicious tone of the poem's beginning quite deliberately and, like Catullus in *Carmen* 68.135–137, to want to concede certain liberties to the beloved as if it were of no importance to him.

The mythological examples in lines 31–40 continue in the same tone. While Propertius otherwise often seeks out examples of steadfast fidelity in love in such comparisons, here he mentions goddesses and heroines who pursued their amorous adventures without restraint and were still held in high regard. So the poet searches for parallels in the manifold mythological world even for this aspect of Cynthia's character. Otherwise it is, above all, for her beauty that she is placed into close vicinity of this poetical world.²⁰³ The relationship between the shepherd Paris and the nymph Oenone on Mount Ida is treated in the greatest detail.²⁰⁴ They loved each other among the sheep, and the whole host of sister nymphs and satyrs looked on. This merry, bucolic picture removes the darkness from the theme and lets one forget words of condemnation, like *peccare*, *furtum amoris*, *famae iactura pudicae*, *rumor non bonus*, which had expressed his opinion of her behavior before.

²⁰¹ In line 23 *me laedit* next to *ad auris* can hardly be the correct text. The *per-venit* of some deteriores or Giardinias *manavit* would give the desired meaning.

²⁰² Günther (1997a) 29f. interprets lines 25ff. as a defensive speech by Cynthia. For this to work, a dialogue would have to be marked somehow and, above all, the soft indulgence following a burst of anger is typical of elegiac poetry. In line 25 Wakker's conjecture *cedere* instead of the transmitted *credere* is an illuminating correction. Camps offers plausible reasons for it.

²⁰³ See 1.19.13–16; 2.28.27–30.51–56. The significance of the myth for Propertius is elucidated by P. Boyancé, *Entretiens Hardt* 2 (1956) 182–88 and G. Lieberg, *RhM* 112 (1969) 225–28.

²⁰⁴ The accusative form *Parim* also appears in 3.13.63; see also Enn. scen. 53 Vahlen. Butler/Barber and Enk ad 34 think the transmitted *Parim* is corrupt and

Without transition Propertius in verse 41 moves from the mythological examples to the general conditions in contemporary Rome. With the term *in tanto stuprorum examine* the tone of moral condemnation also returns immediately. But the conditions in Rome, too, are meant to excuse Cynthia. After all, a single girl takes the lead for her way of life from the world around her, he says. Anyone looking for the morals customary in ancient times under the rule of Saturn in the here and now was totally naive. As if to take the sting out of his condemnation of contemporary Rome, Propertius extends the point of view once more to the mythical world and names further examples for the general rule that gods as well as men are fickle in love. So the final distich acquits Cynthia. If all she does is follow the customs of the world around her, he can't condemn her.

This picture of contemporary Rome appears not to fit in with the image of Augustan Rome with its striving for moral renewal. Presumably, though, Propertius' view was more realistic than Horace's belief expressed in the *Carmen Saeculare* or in Ode 4.15 that a moral renewal could lead Rome back to its former, high standards. On the other hand, the openness with which Propertius expresses his views shows that in the early Augustan period the right to free speech had not yet been curtailed to the same extent as it was later, when Ovid was banished to Tomi because of his *Ars Amatoria*.

Thirty-third elegy

The Isis cult that had many followers among the ladies of Rome involved strict rules of purity, especially in sacred periods when the worshippers of Isis had to be celibate.²⁰⁵ Once when Cynthia for this reason practiced strict abstinence for ten days and kept away from Propertius he hurled violent curses at the foreign cult of a foreign goddess as he describes in this poem.

believe that line 35f. refers to the amorous encounter of Aphrodite and Anchises. The lovers' union among the herds and under the eyes of the nymphs and satyrs is, however, not appropriate for one of the great Olympian goddesses. In the Homeric Aphrodite hymn in lines 75–201 the story is told in a form that is worthier of a goddess. Also, *turba sororum* (37) and *Nai* (40) are hardly applicable to Aphrodite. On the other hand, in 3.13.38–40 Paris is also seen in the midst of a world of shepherds that is close to the gods. See Camps ad 35–40.

²⁰⁵ See Tib. 1.3.23–26; Ov. *Am.* 3.9.33f.; Juv. 6.535f.

The poem starts with a furious monologue in lines 1–20. Line 1f. tells us that Cynthia is devoting herself to the Isis cult for ten days. Full of rage, Propertius then attacks the Egyptian goddess who demands these devotions. He curses the foreign cult that separates the lovers so often. Isis crowned with cow's horns has long since been equated with the Greek Io,²⁰⁶ who was changed into a cow and chased by the wrath of the jealous Hera through the eastern countries all the way to Egypt. Propertius, therefore, uses the Io legend to mock Isis. He insults the goddess in a direct address and mentions shaming details of her life, like the secret love affair with Zeus and being changed into a lowing, oak leaves chewing and ruminating cow. Finally the poet gives vent to his rage in a torrent of questions and threatens that her horns will grow again and she will be chased from Rome back to the Nile.²⁰⁷

In this whole section the exaggerated, overloud tone is unmistakable. One asks in vain, for instance, what should make the goddess's horns grow again. Propertius cannot possibly speak like this in all seriousness. He clearly shows himself up self-ironically in this excited state. He is really furious with Cynthia, in fact, for withdrawing from him for so long, but he does not want to show his anger openly. So he rages all the more against the Egyptian goddess instead.

When he moves to a new motif in line 21, the passing of a certain amount of time appears to be assumed. The poet turns to the beloved with an abrupt *at tu*. Now that she is free from the Isis worship and tender-hearted after his long wait, she ought to give him her love, indeed, to complete 'the course of love' not once but three times.²⁰⁸ Then he briefly sketches in a dialogue situation: The two of them are taking part in a symposium where, of course, one has to imagine other guests, too. Wholly immersed in the enjoyment of the occasion Cynthia barely listens to the poet's pleas and will not be deterred from drinking deeply from the wine and throwing the dice, although it is already past midnight (lines 23–26).

²⁰⁶ Herod. 2.41.2; Diod. 1.24.8.

²⁰⁷ Egypt had a bad reputation in Rome because of Pompey's murder and the Augustan propaganda against Cleopatra (3.11.29–58!); also, like earlier magistrates, Augustus tried to restrict the Isis cult in the capital, at least; see Enk ad 19.

²⁰⁸ To *vacuus*: OLD s.v. *vacuus* No 3. To *iter* (*amoris*): Lucr. 4.1196; Hor. *Epo.* 12.15; Ov. *Am.* 2.726f. See Enk ad 22.

After this terse little dialogue with the beloved, who is engrossed in the pursuit of her pleasure, Propertius repeats the angry outburst from the beginning of the poem, returning to the monologue form and thus obviously expressing his thoughts. In his anger about Cynthia he again looks for someone else to take the blame; this time it is the wine and Icarios, the inventor of the vine.²⁰⁹ Again the poet begins with curses. The *ah pereat* in line 27 corresponds to *utinam pereant* in line 3. Here, too, he moves into a direct address and observes with satisfaction that the attic farmers had been quite right to slay the inventor of the dangerous vine. The mythological examples of the slain centaurs and the blinded Polyphemus belong to a more elevated context than the everyday setting of the scene in lines 21–26, and like the insults to Isis they constitute a deliberate exaggeration. Only toward the end of this part of the poem does he refer to Cynthia's behavior, claiming that wine damages a girl's beauty and corrupts her youth and even that a girl does not know her lover anymore when she is drunk.

In line 35 the poet comes to his senses from his burst of blind rage with a *me miserum* and suddenly realizes the truth: the wine has had no effect on Cynthia. She is as beautiful as ever. She is even quietly reading Propertius' verses. So he must leave her to do what she wants, let her go on drinking and stay at the feast. All he can do in the last lines is to utter weakly the hope that a girl, too, will eventually long for love, although she tires easily of a constant companion.

Since the edition by Hertzberg, frequent doubts have been expressed about the inner cohesion of the elegy, and it has frequently been divided up into two or even three partial poems. The elegy has, however, a homogenous theme and a homogenous tone. The poet describes with a good deal of self-irony his helplessness in dealing with Cynthia's moods. Since he was too weak to show her his disappointment openly, his suppressed rage burst out first against Isis-Io, then against Icarios. Finally, he submits to his fate which he can't change in any case, his *servitium amoris*.

²⁰⁹ The cursing of the first inventor of an aspect of technology (ships and sails) also occurs in 1.17.13f. This widely used topos is examined by Leo (1912) 151ff. La Penna (1951) 7 and the same (1977) 64 notices that the tone in the cursing of Icarios is the same as earlier in the cursing of Isis.

Thirty-fourth elegy

The concluding poem of the second book is, like the prologue poem, an attempt to characterize the nature of elegiac love poetry by juxtaposing it to the epic poetry so highly rated in Rome. In lines 1–24 Propertius precedes this topic with a prelude in which he intends to demonstrate the power of love first before turning to the poetry of love. He accuses a friend, Lynceus,²¹⁰ of having designs on Cynthia and wanting to win her heart. His reproaches sound furious enough: *perfide, flagitium, crimina tanta*, and in his comparisons Propertius remembers bloody battles resulting from unrestrained passion. But the incident he refers to is not a particularly serious one. When he says in line 1 that he had permitted the friend to set eyes on the beloved (*faciem . . . credat*) and in line 22 that the friend had been too free in his words to Cynthia when he was in his cups, this points to a symposium to which Propertius has invited the friend as well as the beloved. The poet's agitated words also lose much of their serious implication when he depicts himself as quite absurdly suspicious, so much so that he is even jealous of his shadow.²¹¹ So it does not come as a surprise when the poet finally gives in: he is prepared to forgive what was said by someone who was all but drunk.

The transition to the next part is smooth. The power of love thus demonstrated in the introductory part of the poem is stressed once more in line 24: All the world is striving for the happiness derived from love. In line 25f. the poet continues this theme for a moment longer. He is pleased that Lynceus is now also feeling the power of the gods of love. But then he immediately proceeds to his central theme, literature: In the friend's new state of mind his previous literary studies are not of much use to him, he tells him. Here Propertius modifies a motif from the seventh and ninth elegies of the first book. There he had demonstrated to the epic poet Ponticus that high-flown epic poetry is not effective in love; in love the elegies of

²¹⁰ In line 1 only the reading *amico* seems to fit into the scene described in the following lines; see Enk ad 1.

²¹¹ Following predecessors, Butler and Barber assume the beginning of a new poem in verse 25, claiming that the poet's anger about Lynceus' seduction attempt and his joy about his love don't fit together. But the scene of the beginning of the poem is not intended to be taken very seriously; see F. Jacoby (1905) 94f.; Enk 433–35.

Mimnermus, who had been acclaimed already by Callimachus as a poet of his own kind,²¹² had more impact than the mighty Homeric epics. It was only with light melodies that Ponticus would be able to conquer a girl. Now the motif is greatly extended. Instead of referring to epic poetry alone he mentions a wealth of literary topics—all useless in matters of love—, such as studies in moral- and natural philosophy, obscure mythological material and again topics of the kind that the epic poet Ponticus had treated.²¹³ The great models of this type of poetry were the masters of the grand style, Aeschylus, Antimachus, and Homer.²¹⁴ Instead of their topics Lynceus should imitate the poetry of a Philetas and Callimachus (line 31f.).²¹⁵ Rather than pointing to the more general example of Mimnermus as in 1.9 he here refers specifically to the Alexandrian school of poetry. In lines 42–44 Propertius then characterizes in greater detail the poetry his friend is meant to practice: he should cultivate a more suave tone, create more finely turned verses, and write of his own love.

In lines 47–50ff. Propertius still remains within the same range of themes.²¹⁶ He, the love poet, can be useful to Lynceus, he claims. When he then contrasts his theme of love to Virgil's weighty epic

²¹² Call., fr. 1.11f. Pf.; see Puelma (1995) 459–72.

²¹³ The expansion into philosophical topics refers back to a tradition: Meleager in *A.P.* 12.101.3f. makes love break the arrogance of proud wisdom. Not all the themes Propertius alludes to can be defined with certainty. Like preceding explainers Álvarez Hernández (1997) 166f. sees the themes mentioned by Propertius as a collection of different types of serious literature. Stroh (1971) 83–98 and Stahl (1985) 175 divide the catalogue into subjects to be recommended or rejected.

²¹⁴ J.-P. Boucher, *REA* 60 (1958) 307–22, and the same (1965) 298–300 conjectures that Lynceus is a pseudonym for the poet Varius; the themes mentioned apparently correspond to his works. Since Varius's works are all but inaccessible, this cannot be proved. The heterogeneity as well as variety of themes mentioned instead suggest that Lynceus is a fictitious figure serving as a typical example.

²¹⁵ Like in line 31f. Callimachus and Philetas are also in 3.1.1–8, 14–18 and 3.9.35–46 models for a subtle, delicate, artfully crafted type of poetry that is juxtaposed to the exalted style of epic poetry. Callimachus alone is mentioned in 2.1.39–42, Philetas in 3.3.52. 4.6.1–10 show that the themes of Book 4 were also going to be shaped in the Alexandrian manner. Camps ad 31 considers replacing the incomprehensible *memorem* with *tenuem* analogous with 3.1.5 and 8, which would fit in well with the *non inflati* in line 32.

²¹⁶ Following the suggestion by L. Mueller, numerous editors place lines 47–50 after line 54. This means that lines 51–54 are in their thematic context, and *harum nulla* (line 51) joins smoothly on to *puella* (line 46); see Günther (1997a) 32. In line 53 Wassenberg's conjecture *restabimus undas* results in a good text close to the transmitted one; see Enk ad 53.

themes in lines 59ff., one might think at first that he is pursuing here the Callimachean antithesis of love poetry versus epic poetry.²¹⁷ However, in contrast to Callimachus and also still Catullus in the ninety-fifth poem Propertius does not disparage epic poetry here. On the contrary, Propertius places the Aeneid, which at that time was in the process of being created, enthusiastically above all works of Greek and Latin literature. Clearly he has detected in the developing work a tone that makes it distinctly different from previous Roman historical epics. Similarly, Horace in Ode 1.6, where he admits his inability to write a warlike epic, refers to the epic poet Varius as one who was able to fulfill this task. Here, in this part of the elegy, the themes shift altogether: Lynceus is lost from sight; Virgil is addressed directly in lines 67, 77, and 79; and after praising the still emerging Aeneid Propertius in lines 67–80 also expresses his admiration for Virgil's already completed works.

In this way Propertius returns imperceptibly to a form of poetry that is closely related to his own love elegies. In lines 67–76 he considers the *Bucolics*. He names Daphnis and Virgil's amorous shepherds and mentions the simple flute (lines 68, 75), which in 2.30.16 is the instrument that best characterizes his own poetry. And the motif of Virgil's shepherds' world, where love is courted with the most artless peasant gifts, clearly relates to his own ideal image of the simple life in 3.13.25–46.²¹⁸ Propertius does not forget the *Georgics* either. In line 67 he depicts Virgil composing poetry on the shady shore of the Southern Italian river Galaesus, where in the *Georgics* an enchanting garden is situated (lines 4.125–146), and in lines 77–80 he praises the *Georgics* as noble poetry worthy of Apollo. Then he returns to the theme of love: the love themes of the *Bucolics*²¹⁹ are just as welcome to the reader, he claims, as the lofty subjects, and Virgil, the 'swan with the gift of song', is no less a poet there

²¹⁷ The preceding parallel *me iuvat* demands in line 61 the correction *Vergilium* of the deteriorates; see Enk. Contrary to the unambiguous wording and to the views of antiquity (Donat. *vit. Verg.* 45), Stahl (1985) 179–83 considers Propertius' praise of the *Aeneid* as not seriously meant. See in contrast Álvarez Hernández (1997) 174–78.

²¹⁸ Propertius wants to point out in Virgil, too, motifs that are typical of his own poetry. He does not, therefore, want to give an 'objective' survey of the thematic sequences in the *Bucolics*. See Boucher (1965) 280–90.

²¹⁹ *Haec* in line 81—as the contrasting *tamen* and the parallels *haec quoque*, *haec etiam* in lines 85, 87 and 89 show—must refer to the love poetry; see Enk ad 81–84.

(Lachmann: *hic*), that is, in the love poetry of the *Bucolics*, although (Korsch: *ut sit*) he writes in a simpler style.²²⁰ Propertius' claim in line 82 that Virgil's love poetry is pleasing, whether the reader is experienced in love or not, is revealing for the thematic change in this part of the poem. The advice he gave to Lynceus that girls are conquered only through love poetry is completely lost from sight.

The praise of the Roman predecessors in the composition of love poetry now follows on smoothly from the love theme in Virgil. Propertius names Varro Atacinus, Catullus, and Calvus from the generation of the neoterics, and then the first Roman elegiac poet Gallus, mentioning in each case the name of the inspirational beloved who was celebrated by these poets. In the final distich he places himself within the ranks of these predecessors and expresses the hope that Cynthia will be as famous as the women beloved by these earlier poets.²²¹

The fact that Propertius sees himself as part of the tradition of the Roman love poets throws light on the way he views himself. The crucial point of comparison is the fact that all four predecessors made one specific beloved woman the center of their poetry,²²² and moreover, one from their own contemporary Roman present.²²³ This distinguishes them from Callimachus, but also from the Greek epigrammatics and Greek erotic literature as such, to all of whom Propertius owes a good deal in terms of his motifs. Although from the works of his Roman forerunners only Catullus' survive while the works of Calvus and Gallus are only preserved in fragments,²²⁴ it is obvious from the little that remains that Propertius has justly placed himself into this tradition.²²⁵

²²⁰ This is how Housman, Butler-Barber, Shackleton Bailey, and Fedeli explain the text; line 83f. is a reference to Verg. *Ecl.* 9,35f. Virgil's own modest comparison of himself as a goose among swans is turned into a compliment: Virgil as the swan rich in songs. On the disputed interpretation of line 83f. see Enk ad 81–84.

²²¹ In line 93 Barber's suggestion *quin vivet* is worth considering; see Enk ad 93; Camps ad 93.

²²² See Williams (1968) 487.

²²³ The numerous, precise place references by Catullus and Propertius demonstrate how their poetry is rooted in the realistic present. They have been collected by La Penna (1977) 176–181 and 183f.

²²⁴ Calvus: fr. 15.16 Morel, also Cat. 96. Gallus: Papyrus, line 1 *nequita . . . Lycori tua*; line 7: Gallus expects his *domina* to respond to his poems as a connoisseur of poetry. Also Verg. *Ecl.* 10, especially lines 21–23. 42f. 46–49 and Ov. *Am.* 1.15.29f. The social changes underlying the poetry are illuminated by Lyne (1980) 8–18.

²²⁵ Propertius has placed himself into this tradition already in 2.25.3f.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE THIRD BOOK: DEFINING A POETIC SELF

Kevin Newman

It is not in his personal emotions . . . that the poet
is in any way remarkable or interesting.

T. S. Eliot, *Tradition and the Individual Talent* (1919)

Τὴν δ' ἀλήθειαν διὰ τί προσέθηκεν ὅμως ἀπορῶ.¹

Philodemus of Gadara

Eliot these days is old-fashioned, though he was echoing both the Russian Formalists and innumerable poetic eminences, among them Catullus (16.3–4) and Thomas Mann.² Philodemus (110–35 BC?), himself an elegiac poet, once complimented on his art by Cicero, was also a literary theorist who dedicated a treatise to Virgil and Varius. He was therefore Propertius' senior contemporary, and may have influenced both his poetry³ and his poetics. Under the scrutiny of modern papyrology, his importance for the understanding of the Augustan aesthetic is being increasingly appreciated (Obbink, 1995; Summers 1995).

Both these critical statements, old or modern, are in debt to Aristotle, who, in Chapter 9 of the *Poetics*, had drawn a sharp distinction between poetry and history. Poetry is “more philosophical and serious than history” (1451b 5–6) because it deals, not with particulars, but with universals. Since art is essentially imitation (1447a 16),

¹ “Why he added the term ‘truth’ [to his definition of poetry?] completely baffles me”: *De Poematis Liber Quintus*, ed. C. Mangoni (Naples 1993) p. 137. The context is fragmentary.

² See *Königliche Hoheit* (1909), in which the author of a bacchic *Evoe!* turns out to be the asthmatic, teetotal, early-to-bed poet Axel Martini. On the Formalists, Erlich (1955) 192ff.

³ Cf. *A.P.* 5.123.1–2 and Prop. 1.3.31ff.; Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.119–22 and Prop. 2.23.12ff.

a takeoff (what the English call a “send-up”) of experience, as a corollary of that, the writer must rarely speak in his own person, for then he has ceased to be an imitator (1460a 7–8).

Aristotle is referring primarily of course to the lofty genres of epic and tragedy, rather than to the humble elegy (*miserabilis . . . elegos*, Hor., *Odes* 1.33.2–3; *exiguos elegos*, *A.P.* 77). Nevertheless, the intriguing background of Propertius 3 is that its maturing author is trying to come to terms with the literary position reformulated by Philodemus. In this, he was perhaps aided, as will be suggested below, by a study of Pindar.

There was, however, a dilemma. In denying the claim of truth, Philodemus argues that poetry is a self-sufficient realm, one therefore on which mundane matters must not intrude. As a Roman and Augustan poet, Propertius does not enjoy such freedom. Even if besotted by the *furor* of love (1.1.7), he is committed to public *utilitas* (*ille furor patriae fuit utilis* of vatic Cassandra, 3.13.65: cf. 4.1.51; [*vates*] . . . *utilis Urbi*, Hor., *Epp.* 2.1.118, 124); committed also to a patron, who (like most Roman patrons) had a political agenda, in this instance uniquely involving a religious renewal. Yet he was Philodemian enough that, in the end, we may say it is not by fidelity to his experience with a particular mistress, but by his loyalty to that Augustan agenda, that Propertius most deviates from the rules of *poésie pure*.

Lycio vota probante deo (“with the Lycian god approving my prayers,” 3.1.38); if vatic (2.10.19; 4.6.1), sacerdotal (3.1.3; 13.59) Propertius sits on an Apolline tripod, one may think of its three legs as all under more than usual tension. He accepts Philodemus’ veto on truth, if that means enslavement to trivial “facts,” such as a single, real-life Cynthia; but he is also one of the *genus irritabile vatum* (Hor., *Epp.* 2.2.102; cf. Prop. 2.10.19; 4.6.1), bound therefore to a truth that is Augustan, national. As a poet of the modern movement,⁴ he intensely admires Callimachus, yet feels free to play with, even reverse, Callimachean positions and catchwords. Finally, even though he is a poet in what Aristotle at least would define as a non-epic genre (*Poetics* 1460a 2–5), like lyric Pindar, he puts on display an epic talent.

⁴ *Poetas novos*, Suetonius, *de gramm.* 16; *nova carmina*, Virgil, *Ecl.* 3.86.

Primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos ("I am the first to advance as priest from a pure spring," 3.1.3) conveniently sums up the ambivalence of his attitude, which was shared by vatic Horace (*Odes* 3.1.2–3). One of these metaphors, that of the *fons purus*, is Callimachean (*Hy.* 2.111–12; *Epigr.* 28.3–4). The other, hieratic, vatic, is not. But there is a Greek poet who unites them. It is Pindar who views his poetic mission as mantic (μάντις ὡς τελέσσω ἱεραπόλος, "so that I may fulfil [my commission?] as prophet and priest," *Parth.* 1.5–6); sees himself as the spokesman of a community (ἴδιος ἐν κοινῷ σταλείς, "a private person in a public role," *Ol.* 13.49); and yet derives his poetry from a sacred spring (πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἄγνὸν ὕδωρ, "I will give him a draught of Dirce's pure water," *Isth.* 6.74). A master of lyric narrative, Pindar is also (in some places) epic's rival: in *Pythian* 6 (cf. Arctinus' *Aethiopsis*); in *Nemean* 1 (a kind of *Heracleis*); most notably in *Pythian* 4 (a kind of *Argonautica*).

Does Book 3 indicate that Propertius had taken occasion to acquaint himself with Pindar (giving a keener point to Horace's later *quisquis studet aemulari*, *Odes* 4.2.1)? Earlier, following Callimachus (βροντῶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, "not mine to thunder," *Aet.* I, fr. 1.20), he had rejected poetic thunders (cf. 2.1.40). Now, in Book 3, with *qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat* ("such breath as thunders from Pindar's mouth," 17.40), Pindar is at least a possibility. Perhaps *certatis* ("strive," 1.13) and the associated imagery of the chariot already signal a kinship with Pindar's "agonistic" poetry (Fitzgerald, 1987). The Pindaric poetic would have been useful to him in more than one way. It certainly allowed its honoured place to "truth" (cf. *Ol.* 10.3–4). But it was not truth about the poet's personal, private life!

This is the complex background—Pindaric, Callimachean, Philodemean, Augustan—of the cluster of five elegies at the beginning of Book 3, seeking as it were to give some global overview of the poet's art, and filled at times with an alliterative, assonant, epic sense of Roman grandeur (*Arma deus Caesar dices meditatur ad Indos* . . . , "Our god Caesar plans to carry his arms as far as the wealthy Indies," 4.1). But the comic/mimic sixth elegy too in its way is programmatic. There, in what the Formalists call a *dénudation du procédé* (обнажение приёма, *Entblößung des Kunstgriffs*, "laying bare of the device": Todorov, 1965, p. 289), no authorial ego is introduced. So also Cynthia's name is suppressed until the final dismissals in elegies 21, 24, 25. The leading ladies of earlier poems in this book where her name does not occur should not be too easily identified with her (and that is hardly

possible anyway in 3.20). The first persons, even the “Propertius” of poems 3.17 and 10.15, are in the first place Philodemean literary constructs rather than excerpts from a diary. No one will suppose, for example, that the dreaming poet was “really” addressed by Phoebus in poem 3 in terms reminiscent of the Preface to Callimachus’ *Aetia*, even though a real sense of vocation is conveyed.

Book 3 presents what Pindar calls (*Ol.* 6.3–4) a *πρόσωπον τηλαυγές*, a “gleaming façade.” Its beginning resonates with the names of Callimachus and Philetas, whose Roman heir Propertius is (*ingredior*, 1.3 ~ *ingressi*, 1.6). They are hailed as if still living; and indeed *quamve bibistis aquam* (“what water did you drink?”) at v. 6 here may allude to *la soif des morts* (Déonna, 1939), in their case assuaged by the very choice of poetic styles they made. At the start of the *Aetia* dreaming Callimachus had recalled Hesiod’s encounter with the Muses. Much more dramatically, he had opened the *Iamboi* by assuming the mask of Hipponax *redivivus*. The dream of the *Aetia* is to be more closely echoed in elegy 3. Perhaps then it is the resurrection of the first *Iambos* we are to think of here (cf. *φθιτὸν Ἰππώνακτα* [“dead Hipponax”] in the *Diegesis* to *Ia.* 1 = Pf. vol. I, p. 163; *Callimachi Manes*, “spirit of Callimachus,” 3.1.1). That recall to the elegy of an iambic element would already signpost the brusquerie of poems 24 and 25.

Certainly, as it develops, Book 3 may introduce certain pre-Ovidian standardizations of elegiac technique, such as the disyllabic last word in the pentameter.⁵ It does not, however, signal any fundamental alteration in Propertius’ literary stance. Even in Book 1, the genial poet had contrasted (and by implication praised) his own choice of love elegy against the epic encapsulated in Antimachus or Homer’s cyclic imitators (7.1–3: cf. *ingeniis*, 22)—and yet what a hypnotically epic (Euphorionic?) sound in lines such as *Pollucem cultu non Hilaira soror* (“nor did Hilaira her sister [attract] Pollux by any cosmetics,” 1.2.16)! Similarly, in Book 2, a prefatory allegiance to Callimachus at least was already on the record (1.39–42). What Pindar may have inspired in Book 3 was not any new allegiance, but a fresh outburst of self-confidence. We hear the poet at the height of his powers, able to expatiate both on the genesis of his Muse (*a me/nata . . . Musa*,

⁵ Though Propertius continues to use, like epic Virgil, dramatic one-word spondees in the fourth foot of the hexameter: *Coi* (3.1.1); *vestro* (1.19: contrast *date vestro* here with *bello date*, 4.7); *regum* (3.3); *vastum* (9.3), *alia*. Cf. *altae . . . Romae*, *Aen.* 1. 7: Newman (2001).

"the Muse born from me," 3.1.9–10: not, incidentally, "a Cynthia") and on the audience he seeks to please: his patron(s) of course, but more largely what he calls the *turba puellarum* ("throng of girls," 2.10; cf. 3.19–20).

Both these phrases of his are in debt in their way to Callimachus: *a me nata* with ἀπ' ἐμεῦ . . . τίκτεσθαι ("to be born from me," *Aet.*-pref. 19–20); *turba* with φύλον ("tribe," *Aet.*-pref. 7: cf. σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια, "I hate all that belongs to the people," *Epigr.* 28.4; ὁμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος, "the majority of men," in a literary-critical context, Pindar, *Nem.* 7.24). But there is poetic licence. In the first quotation here, Callimachus offers only a negative (μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ . . .) parallel for Propertius' positive, triumphant metaphor of birth; and Catullus had been equally negative in the preface to his translation of the Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος (*nec potis . . . dulcis Musarum . . . fetus*, "nor can [my purposed will bring forth] sweet children of the Muses," 65.3). In the second, Callimachus, like Horace later (*non ego . . . grammaticas ambire tribus . . . dignor*, "I do not deign to canvass the scholars' tribes," *Epp.* 1.19.39–40), emphatically rejects the "tribe."⁶ But this is the very "crowd" which Propertius, even though he will eventually style himself the Roman Callimachus (4.1.64), here chooses (see also *Veneris . . . , mea turba, columbae*, "the doves of Venus, my very own flock," 3.3.31).⁷ Comic, iambic Plautus illustrates the amatory sense of *columba* (*As.* 693, *Cas.* 138).

The exegete of Propertius 3 (and of his poems in general) must confront this paradox of adaptation and contradiction of Callimachus' precepts immediately. The first need is for an acquaintance with the conventional symbols, both positive and negative in their connotations, of the Callimachean poetic, what elsewhere has been called the

⁶ Echoed in S. Mallarmé's "donner un sens plus pur aux mots de la tribu" (*Le Tombeau d'Edgar Poe* 1877), anglicized by T. S. Eliot as "to purify the dialect of the tribe", *Little Gidding* II.74.

⁷ Horace tends rather to tamely follow Callimachus. Yet in his памятник ("Memorial," 1836), for all its Horatian allegiance, A. S. Pushkin follows Propertius' positive re-evaluation of the "people" (к нему не зарастёт народная тропа "to it the people's path shall not become overgrown," v. 2). He substitutes later, however, for Horace's and Propertius' "Pyramids" the "pillar of Alexandria" (Александрийского столпа, 4). This was the so-called "Pillar of Pompey," in reality erected in honor of the emperor Diocletian, seen still standing in an engraving of Alexandrian antiquities made for Napoleon in 1798 (*Description de l'Égypte, Antiquités*, Vol. V: reproduced in *Alexandria*, ed. G. L. Steen [New York 1993], p. 108). How unerringly the Russian poet's imagination converged on the Alexandrian challenge! How Propertian is his response!

“Alexandrian Code.” Its injunctions did not all originate with Callimachus. Some of them at least are in debt already to Pindar (Newman, 1967, pp. 45–48), and implicit in Euripides’ stylistic claims in his debate with Aeschylus in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*⁸—which no doubt means in both cases that they were owed to Sophistic stylistics. But Callimachus was their most important intermediary, and those who deploy them are normally thinking of him in the first instance.

The Alexandrian Code (cf. Newman 1990, 457). It is not a secret cipher, but a complex of ideas about particular choices in poetry, obvious enough in antiquity, not so apparent in our day. It includes allusions to the need for brevity (cf. αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο, τάμοι δ’ ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῇ, “let the reader himself add to the meaning, and so cut length off the song,” *Aetia* 3, fr. 57.1; ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη, “succinct style,” *Epigr.* 8.6), and in general for refinement and charm of technique (λεπτότης, “grace:” cf. κατὰ λεπτόν, *Aet.*-pref. 11; χαίρετε λεπταὶ/ ῥήσιες,⁹ “hail, graceful utterances,” *Epigr.* 27.3–4); to the envy (Βασκανίης, *Aet.*-pref. 17; *Epigr.* 21.4; Φθόνος, *Hy.* 2.105, 107, 113) of the crowd⁹ (φῶλον, *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.7: cf. ὀλοὸν γένος, “destructive brood,” *Aet.*-pref. 17, and terms such as Τελχίνες, πολλοί); to Hesiod (as the alternative to the hijacked Homer: Ἡσιόδῳ, *Aet.* I, fr. 2.2; Ἡσιόδου, praising Aratus, *Epigr.* 27.1) and words meant to recall Hesiod (*Helicon*, Prop. 3.3.1; 5.19); to pastoral themes (θύος . . . θρέψαι, “to tend a flock,” *Aet.*-pref. 23–24; ποιμένι, “shepherd” *Aet.* 1, fr. 2.1; cf. fr. 73 with many pastoral parallels);¹⁰ to the poet as something of a buffoon (μάργος, *Ia.* 3.38), a child (παῖς ᾄτε, *Aet.*-pref. 6); yet to poetry paradoxically as offering restricted access (cf. στενωτέρην, “narrower,” *Aet.*-pref. 28: *non . . . lata via*, “no broad way,” Prop. 3.1.14); to the poet as poor (οἶδ’ ὅτι μευ πλούτου κενεαὶ χέρες, “I know my hands are empty of money,” *Epigr.* 32.1; cf. Prop. 3.2.11–14; 5.3–6); as travelling untrodden paths (*Aet.*-pref. 27–28, a metaphor especially in debt to Pindar, *Paeon* 7b. 11; cf. Prop. 3.1.18); in Latin poets, this also occurs as the claim to being “first” with an adaptation of a Greek genre (“*primus* language”); as unwilling on artistic grounds to write in more elaborate or eulogistic style (βασιλ[ήων δῆρι]ας, “[the quarrels of?] kings,” *Aet.*-pref. 3–4: *reges et proelia*, “kings and battles,” Virgil, *Ecl.* 6.3; *bella . . . tui*

⁸ Excellent summary (with bibliography) in Neil Hopkinson (1988) 88–91, 98–101.

⁹ “O sprich mir nicht von jener bunten Menge,” Goethe, *Faust* I, “Vorspiel auf dem Theater,” 59.

¹⁰ E.g., Tasso, *Aminta* (1573), v. 385; Henry Fielding, *Tom Jones* (1749: repr. London 1962) I, p. 192.

Caesaris, “your Caesar’s wars,” Prop. 2.1.25; *proelia*, Hor., *Odes* 4.15.1: what is more generally called the *recusatio* [“refusal,” Lucas 1900]); as a water-drinker (cf. Call., *Hy.* 2.110–12 *al.*; Prop. 3.51–52; *aquae potioribus*, Hor., *Epp.* 1.19.3; ὑδροπότας, *A.P.* 11.20.6; Pindar, *Isth.* 6.74, quoted above); as more concerned with love (cf. Μίμνερμος, *Aet.*-pref. 11: the sense of this passage is paraphrased by Propertius at 1.9.11) than war—even though Mimnermus had written an elegiac *Smyrneis* from which martial fragments survive.

Not all the items of this code are necessarily deployed by every poet in every poem. But, when they do occur, we naturally expect them to be used in their original (Callimachean) sense. *Turba*, just noted from 2.10, ought then to allude strictly speaking to the coarse throng, or “tribe” (φῦλον <ἄκανθές>, “[thorny] tribe,” *Aet.*-pref. 7; cf. φῦλον ἄκανθολόγων, “tribe of [scholarly] thorn-pluckers,” *A.P.* 11.20.2) of the hopelessly philistine with whom the Alexandrian poet wants nothing to do: *odi profanum vulgus* (“I have no time for the uninitiated crowd”). Propertius is quite willing to use it in that sense: *at mihi quod vivo detraxerit invida turba* (“but whatever the jealous crowd may rob me of in my lifetime,” 3.1.21). Here, instead, it describes the poet’s adoring (*colit*) audience (cf. 9.46 quoted below), so attractive to him that momentarily he is prepared to turn the Callimachean (and Pindaric) significance of the term upside down.

Another example in Book 3 is furnished by the end of poem 2. In referring to Homer, Aristotle had implied a contrast of τέχνη, “art,” with φύσις, “natural gift” (*Poetics* 1451a 24). Callimachus, who perhaps had trouble with Pindar’s σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φῦᾰ (“wise is he that knows much by nature’s grace,” *Ol.* 2.86), had ordained that σοφία (his inherited, Pindaric word for the poetic gift) should be judged by τέχνη (*Aet.*-pref. 17–18). It is clear from Horace (*A.P.* 408) that Hellenistic rhetorical theory had developed this antithesis into an *opposition* between *natura* and *ars*, *ars* and *ingenium*. Propertius, who in view of his allegiance, re-asserted at the very outset of Book 3, to Callimachus’ refined technique (*exactus tenui pumice versus eat*, “let the shaping pumice-stone refine the verse’s flow,” 1.8) might have been expected to plump for *ars*, in the very next elegy of this book (as already in 1.7.22) rests his claim on *ingenium* (2.25–26). Τὸ δὲ φῦᾰ κράτιστον ἅπαν (“in every case what breeding gives is best,” Pindar, *Ol.* 9.100): contrast Horace’s irony (*A.P.* 295).

Orbem (2.1) is another instance of this Propertian topsy-turvydom. *Orbis* is the Greek κύκλος, the wearisome routine of the hackneyed

epic, “detested” by Callimachus (ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, *Epigr.* 28.1: *non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem*, “you shall not linger around the cheap, commodious routine style,” Hor., *A.P.* 132). Here it becomes the normal round of Propertius’ *amatory* manner, abandoned for a moment while he has been arguing about the niceties of poetic style.

Book 3 ends (poems 24 and 25) with the poet’s resolve to be his own man in the future, and consequent dismissal of Cynthia’s transitory charms. In the preceding elegy, he announces that he has lost his blarney-filled tablets (*diserta*, 23.6: only here in Propertius, and perhaps a half-ironic reminiscence of neoteric stylistics: cf. Hor., *Epp.* 1.5.19). To the attentive ear this was a clear indication that there were to be no more elegies of the sort that earlier had made the poet celebrated; and, if the suggestion is correct that Book 4, when it eventually joined the *œuvre*, was as much *compulsus* as Horace’s Fourth Book of *Odes*, perhaps no more elegies were intended at all. In 24, he ruefully recalls themes from 1.1 (witchcraft, the advice of friends). A farewell of this sort, assailing the infidelity of a mistress, reminds us of the already mentioned iambic aspect of the elegy, illustrated also by Archilochus. It finds an obvious parallel in iambic Catullus. As in Catullus, elsewhere the iambic impulse emerges in Propertius in the form of satire.

* * *

Individual elegies of Book 3 have been discussed in *Augustan Propertius* (Newman, 1997). It will be convenient if the necessarily brief remarks to be made later about them here are preceded by further notes on a number of general points affecting the entire book.

The Spoudogeloion. Meleager, whom Propertius began by adapting (1.1.1–4 = *A.P.* 12.101), had written Menippean satire (*A.P.* 7.417.4). The serio-comic, which this implies, continues to play a major part in European literature, and serio-comedy may be traced even in Homer, who shows us Andromache δακρύνει γέλασσα (‘laughing through her tears,’ *Il.* 6.484). Aristotle argues that tragedy itself originates as a late solemnisation of satyric performances (διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν ὁπὲ ἀπεσεμνύνθη, ‘its satyric origin made it slow to acquire stateliness,’ *Poetics* 1449a 20), still retaining the marks of its origin (an example is the Euripidean revival of the trochaic tetrameter). M. Bakhtin (1963, p. 152) makes essentially the same point when he introduces the concept of “reduced laughter,” *редуцированный смех*. Even when

the lights dim and the atmosphere changes, the comedian's apparatus remains on stage. Euripides' *Bacchae* offers a good example of this mixture of moods, *comédie noire*.

Both Virgil (*Ecl.* 7.17) and Horace (*A.P.* 226) use the combination *seria ludo* ("serious things [mixed] with play"). Propertius may not use the actual phrase, but this grey area, neither one thing nor the other, is where he likes to operate. A mistake of recent exegesis has been to find some poems wholly serious, and quite different ones wholly comic, even sarcastic. But students of his poems and their cycles should keep their options open. One must never forget the *schattenfreudiger Geist der Römer*.

The Analogy with Pindaric Technique. Propertius escaped from the other horn of his dilemma (Philodemus vs. public engagement) via Pindar, whose name has already occurred here with unexpected frequency. His transition was eased by the fact that Callimachus himself was Pindar's disciple. He had composed at least two elegiac epinicians, one for an unknown victor (fr. 383: was this Queen Berenice?) echoing in its opening ὀφείλω ("owe,") a Pindaric idiom; and the second in honor of Sosibius (Σωσιβίου Νίκη, fr. 384), a royal minister of the day. Enjoying this sanction, in Augustan poetry too, Pindar is a looming presence: sometimes overt, as when Horace points out the difficulties faced by anyone trying to follow so bold an example (*audaces*, "bold" [and therefore inimitable], *Odes* 4.2.10; contrast *audacia certe/laus* [mihi] *erit*, "boldness will surely bring me credit," Prop. 2.10.5–6); sometimes covert, as when, in the proem to *Georgics* 3 (17ff.), charioteering Virgil sees himself presiding at some sort of ἀγών, "contest," or when Propertius also becomes a chariot driver in the opening elegy of Book 3 (13–14).

Pre-Alexandrian notions of style in Pindar were mentioned above. Pindar's art generally is a study unto itself—too important, however, to be left to the Pindarists! Apparently *un beau désordre*, it is in fact quite tightly structured,¹¹ as the poetic sketched in the proem to the third *Olympian* (4–9), as well as many metaphors of building, weaving,

¹¹ Ῥυθμῶν Πινδαρικῶν ἔννομον εὐεπίην, "the law-bound eloquence of Pindar's rhythms," Ausonius, *Epp.* 10.30. So earlier Statius: *qua lege recurat/Pindaricae vox flexa lyrae*, "in obedience to what law the trilling voice of Pindar's lyre bends back," *Silvae* 5.3.151–52. (For *recurro* in metrical theory, see Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epp.* 8.11.5). Contrast Horace's *numerus . . . lege solutis*, "numbers untrammelled by law," *Odes* 4.2.11–12, evidently an exaggeration made for apologetic purposes, which has had an unfortunate influence.

and other comparable images of orderly sequence, make clear (Newmans 1984).

It is unlikely that Propertius could have followed Pindar in any detail. Yet both poets take great leaps of imagination (what Dante [*Par.* 33.142] and Michelangelo [*Sonnet* 65.5, Guasti] call *fantasia*); and the accusation of random meandering, directed too often against Pindar (ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὅτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον, "like a bee he flits from this theme to that," *Py.* 10.54), is easily levelled against Propertius also: hence those fussy re-arrangements with which editors insistently mar their texts. His use of τάξις ("order"), including both stanzaic division and central positioning, is, however, visible in many poems;¹² and, in the third book, such a structure is the key to the eleventh elegy, aiming in essence to celebrate Augustus as Pompey's heir. It is precisely thoughts of Pompey that occupy the center of the poem (35–36). Throughout, Propertius' ego is simply a manipulable prop. Philodemus might have approved of that, but equally he would have found such public engagement shocking.

Propertius' Language. (See also "Orality" below.) Much has been written on this topic, and there is of course much more to be said. Early enough here he uses *ingredior* (3.1.3), "process" (*Phoebe fave: novus ingreditur tua templa sacerdos*, "A blessing, Apollo! New is the priest who now proceeds into your temple," Tibullus, 2.5.1); and one senses in his sacerdotal lines the deliberate pace of the self-admiring verse, perhaps a gift from Euphorion, aided by the Roman pentameter's trick of generally ending with a pause. His vocabulary displays a certain Augustan classicism: simple comparison with Catullus shows how much has been culled, in the way of affective diminutives, for example, or of obscenities. Like New Comedy (Aristotle, *E. N.* 4.1128a 22–24), he substitutes, for αἰσχρολογία "crude language," ὑπόνοια, "innuendo" (*armis*, 3.1.29; cf. 8.29 and 33). There are some words that might have been more common, such as *peccare*, which instead he employs sparingly, and which in fact elegiac, "lascivious" Ovid uses rather more freely.¹³ Filled with echoing proper names, more often than not Greek, Propertius' language becomes elevated, *pompōs*. *Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros* ("to carry the emblems of Italy in the Greek dance," 3.1.4): here *alles kommt auf das Ohr an*. Quintilian (12.10.33) would ascribe this to his preoccupation with the *dulce*, though

¹² Tordeur (1988) 105–07.

¹³ Pichon (1991) 227 (4 examples in Propertius; 8 in the *Amores* alone).

Propertius himself uses this adjective, not stylistically, but sexually (3.8.1 and 29). Callimachus' Μίμνερμος . . . γλυκός ("Mimnermus . . . sweet," *Aet.*-pref. 11) may be compared, sharing both meanings.

He retains some colloquial (comic) words (*sicine*, "just like that?" 3.6.9; *plorare*, "to boo-hoo," 12.1). Indeed, his *dilectus verborum* ("choice of language") may even be at times bizarre (*rostro te premet ansa tuo*, "the hook will hold you fast by your snout," 4.1.142). Does he share with Gallus and Virgil the practice of what Horace calls the *callida iunctura*, "suggestive linkage"?¹⁴ Perhaps not quite in the same way, but, if that may include "estranging context," Propertius certainly forces the meanings of common words: *vix sua nosset humus*, 3.1.30 ("his own patch would hardly have known him"); *nervis hiscere posse meis*, 3.4 ("to be able to gulp out [such mighty themes] on my own strings/with my own sinews"); *insinuentur opes*, 9.28 ("are poured into your lap"). Study of word frequency in the poems shows how certain favorite terms ("shore," "water," "bones," "threshold") are continually repeated and combined. And how often the poet is "compelled" to act (cf. 3.9.22; 21.1; 24.11) rather than simply acts! All this is a window into a Romantic, furious (in Ariosto's sense),¹⁵ "melancholic" soul, much too great however in his case for mere infatuation to possess.

The Text. Propertius did not mean to supply a γυμνάσιον εἰς ἐξήγησιν γραμματικὴν ("an exercise ground for scholarly exegesis," Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, ed. Dindorf III, p. 40). Tidying up is necessary, but on the whole the most useful text for the student is one which departs as little as possible from some sort of manuscript *traditio*. Textual emendation must proceed from a literary-critical understanding of the poetry, and above all from the concepts of orality, performance, *mouvance*. Propertius' bold idiosyncrasies, inconsistencies, ellipses (and alogical imprecisions!) are hardly yet understood. We need to wrestle with the problems his *ingenium* presents, rather than laud the *ingenium* of moderns. A "Digest of Propertian Idioms," supplementing H. Tränkle (1960), on the lines of Riddell's handbook to Plato, is greatly needed.¹⁶

¹⁴ Gallus: *templa . . . fixa . . . spoliis*, fr. 3.3–4, Buechner (for *spolia adfixa templis*); Virgil: *intenditque locum sertis*, *Aen.* 4.506 (for *loco sertis*); Horace: *A.P.* 47–48.

¹⁵ For his elegy *De Diversis Amoribus* (1489–94?) and Propertius, see Newman (1986) 302–05.

¹⁶ Had such a book existed, Butler and Barber would not have been puzzled in 1933 (ad 3.4.16) by a trick of parenthesis earlier explained by Lachmann on 4.3.15ff. (pp. 242–43 of the 1816 edition).

Date. The book follows the death of Marcellus in 23, allusively lamented in poem 18, and precedes the settlement with the Parthians in 20 (cf. 4 and 12, where there is still talk of war). The “imitations” of Horace, *Odes* 3.30, in the opening two elegies in this regard are, however, an uncertain guide. Propertius may have heard Horace at some earlier public reading of the sort attested by Ovid (*Tristia* 4.10.49–50: cf. Hor., *Sat.* 1.4.73; *A.P.* 438). There is also always the matter of lost common sources. The allusion to the Pyramids, for example (2.19), is probably owed to some now unknown passage of Gallus. He had, after all, seen them personally; and in fact, the claim that writings outlast the Pyramids is already a theme of Egyptian literature of the Middle Kingdom.¹⁷ The tomb of C. Cestius, still visible in Rome at the Porta San Paolo, confirms that under Augustus the pyramid had become familiar.

Interestingly, Horace, whose three books of *Odes* are dated to 23, and Propertius, putting out Book 3 soon afterward (22? 21?), would have been publishing epochal volumes almost at the same time, as already suggested for Book 4 and Horace, *Odes* 4. Whether this simultaneity was in response to some sort of hint from their patron Maecenas is guesswork. Though it may well be true that there was some dislike between the two poets (cf. Hor., *Epp.* 2.2.92–101), perhaps whatever allusions to Horace are found here in Book 3 were meant as compliments, as Virgil alludes to Varius (*Aen.* 6.621–22). In quoting from distinguished contemporaries, both poets may be thought to confer on them classical status.

*The Social Background. The Concept of the Mistress.*¹⁸ The student will always remember the difference between Propertius’ world, its social expectations and conventions, and ours (whatever “ours” is, often quite differently perceived north and south of the Alps, or on opposite shores of the Atlantic!). Propertius was an example of *homo Mediterraneus*,

¹⁷ 2000–1786 BC? Cf. “The Immortality of Writers”, in: *Ancient Egyptian Literature II*, ed. M. Lichtheim (Berkeley 1976) 175–78.

¹⁸ On the erotic in general, Georges Bataille, *L’Érotisme* (Paris 1957). On the literary erotic, Proust’s musings in *Un Amour de Swann* (*À la Recherche du Temps Perdu I: Du côté de chez Swann*, Paris 1920–21) are still challenging. Odette de Crécý’s principles of artistic criticism (“s’il [= Vermeer] avait souffert par une femme, si c’était une femme qui l’avait inspiré. . . . La poésie . . . il n’y aurait rien de plus beau si c’était vrai, si les poètes pensaient tout ce qu’ils disent” [“did the artist suffer because of a woman? Was he inspired by a woman?” and “poetry would be very fine if it were true, if the poets meant all they said”]), *ibid.*, p. 283 [= éd. Jean-Yves Tadié, Paris 1999, pp. 197–98]) tend to live on!

only to be (half)-appreciated even by the visitor who has spent time in Italy and Rome, and not at all by the stay-at-home. He was acutely aware of his need to *far figura*, part of which is even to swagger. (There are women who like their men to swagger, as the Rolling Stones and their leader Sir Michael Jagger know.) The vetoes of the Lex Julia, still embarrassing the emperor Justinian, confirm that his society sharply divided women into members of the family—mothers, wives, daughters—worthy of all consideration (Coriolanus!); and women who, lacking other social claims, were legitimately viewed as sex objects to be used or flaunted as enhancements of the male (cf. *visum duxerat*, “had taken [me] to look over,” Catullus 10.2).

The concept of the mistress therefore, usually taken as understood, merits further examination. Such women, outside the normal social calculus, are “apart” (in Hebrew קדושה, *qadosha*, but the adjective also means “holy”), creatures of heaven or hell. They may, for example, be in the service of a goddess such as Isis (4.5.34)—or the ambivalent Ishtar/Astarte, who combined aspects of Venus, Juno, and even Diana. Archaeology suggests that the Temple of Juno at Etruscan Pyrgi, from which were recovered the gold plates now in the Villa Giulia (Room 22) recording a treaty between its king and Carthage, was modified to accommodate such sacred prostitution.¹⁹ Lucilius may still know of it (*scorta Pyrgensia*, “harlots of Pyrgi,” 1271 M.). “Cynthia” is evidently in the service of the Moon (Ishtar/Diana), who presided over the giddy sub-lunar sphere of madness and uncertainty (Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 2. §56).

An ancient paradigm, established in Ishtar and her lovers (*Gilgamesh*, ed. George, 1999, pp. 49–50), and repeated, for example in the cases of the Magna Mater and Attis, Venus and Adonis, Venus and Anchises, joined a powerful goddess of sexual passion to a male, flawed (inferior) consort. Even in the days of St. Paul, the Town Clerk of Ephesus describes that entire city as the “temple-sweeper” (νεωκόρος) of Diana (NT Acts 19:35). For the Romans, this coupling was visible as near as the temple of Venus Erycina, in Sicily, tended by *Veneriei servi* (“slaves of Venus”). Since Eryx was a Carthaginian colony, “Venus” there was clearly Astarte. At the human level, a word such as *domina*—used by Catullus of goddesses (Diana, 34.9; Cybele, 35.14; 63.13, 91); at the culmination of the central cycle boldly extended

¹⁹ N. Spivey and S. Stoddart, *Etruscan Italy* (London 1990) 125 with illustration 75.

by him, though in correlation with *domus* (68.68 and 156), to Lesbia—must still be regarded as having some religious aura about it. Why not even in Gallus (fr. 4.2, Buechner) and, on occasion, in Propertius? Both Cytheris (later Lycoris) and Cynthia, after all, bear theophoric names. If we are to take that seriously, the term will still imply the relationship of quasi-goddess and slave. Is this concept, advertised by Propertius as late as Book 3 (24.3), Semitic/Asian in inspiration?

In Greek, Isocrates, not the most romantic of authors, is aware of this divine dimension to erotic δουλεύειν (“be a slave to,” *Hel. Enc.* 57). Yet, if Plato’s Cephalus quotes Sophocles as saying that he has fled from heterosexual intercourse as from a “lunatic and savage master” (λυττῶντά τινα καὶ ἄγριον δεσπότην, *Rep.* 1.329c 4), δέσποινα (“mistress”) does not seem to have this charged amatory sense for the poets of the *Garlands* either of Meleager or of Philip. Homer of course already attests its place *within* marriage (*Od.* 3.403; 7.347).

As Helen’s post-Homeric fate shows, men find such women both fascinating and repellent. It is in the nature of male psychology that, as part of the *amantium irae* (“lovers’ quarrels”), they will dilate on both these (imposed) facets of their mistress’ makeup. Eventually, finding life with such irrationality too irksome, they will appeal to reason for rescue (*Mens Bona, si qua dea es, tua me in sacraria dono*, “Sound Mind, mysterious goddess, I make myself an offering to your shrine,” 3.24.19).²⁰ The mistress may then be sent off to her other world: to heaven (Dante, Petrarch); to hell (Archilochus, Catullus, Propertius).

Propertius is indeed to be congratulated on granting to women of this second class some of the consideration normally reserved for the first: in patiently allowing Cynthia, for example, to indulge the sharp tongue of a wife. Devotion to a mistress of this uxorious sort however was not original. Antony’s infatuation with his *uxor* Cytheris is pilloried by Cicero in the Second *Philippic* (§§20, 69). Catullus himself, with his talk of the *foedus amoris* (“treaty of love,” 87.3–4; cf. 109.6), picked up by Cicero in the *Pro Caelio* (§34), and of the rules of *amicitia/amor*, elevates Lesbia to the rank of honorary wife. Propertius however can be quite tender (Ovid, *Ars* 3.333), and in a literature of soldiers, lawyers and administrators, that is welcome.

²⁰ The *si*-clause here does not express scepticism. It uses a religious idiom: cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig-Berlin 1913) 144ff., and Fraenkel’s note on Aeschylus, *Ag.* 160 (Oxford 1950). The temple of Mens, to which a surviving colossal head of a female deity in the Museo Montemartini (M.C. 1589) is assigned, had been founded at Rome by M. Aemilius Scaurus in 58 BC.

The multipolar mind. Like the Hebrews, the Romans apprehend the world differently from the bipolar sensibility of the Greeks. Propertius (judged, as he must not be, by Greek logic) often presents his ideas and images, including those drawn from mythology, in a confused and inconsistent way, since his aim is not to convince intellectually but to impress emotionally. Never without the self-confidence that timorous Horace so visibly lacks,²¹ he was already seen boldly reversing, for example, in the opening elegies of this book certain motifs associated with his master. He loves to parade his epic skills, often paradoxically in his exploitation of the pentameter, in the very act of “refusing” to exercise them (cf. Cicero, *de Orat.* 2. §26).

Numquam nimis dicitur quod numquam satis discitur (“short memories need long lessons”). Propertius was not a “liberal,” but not a “phallocrat” either; not an anti war protester; not a Green or against globalization or anything else of that sort (contrast the excitement crackling in the alliterative patterns of a line such as *qui finem imperii Bactra futura canent*, “who will celebrate Bactra as the bound of your empire,” 1.16). How easily, for example, he sees Parthia as coming under the “rods” of Roman power (4.5). But in the preceding line he has also noted the extension there of Roman law (*sub tua iura*). Cicero, whether he coined the noun *humanitas* or not, was as humane as most Romans, but these are the realities he too takes for granted. Western scholars uncomfortable with any of this should ask if they wish to repudiate the chequered histories (and glorious achievements) of their own societies.

Patronus/amicus. A final point in this context is the etiquette of the Roman relationship to a patron (White, 1994). In being taken up by such distinguished figures as Tullus, whose uncle was joint consul with Octavian in 33, and then by Maecenas, Propertius had been recognized at the very highest levels of the new regime. His acceptance of such patronage was entirely voluntary, but once he accepted it

²¹ *Cupidum . . . vires/deficiunt*, “I would like to, but my strength fails me,” *Sat.* 2.1.12–13; cf. *nec meus audet/rem temptare pudor quam vires ferre recusent*, “I am too modest to attempt a subject beyond my powers,” *Epp.* 2.1.258–59. Propertius by contrast declares: *quodsi deficiant vires, audacia certe/laus erit. in magnis et voluisse sat est* (“My strength may fail me, but boldness will certainly win me praise. In mighty enterprises the wish alone suffices,” 2.10.5–6). Ovid’s epitaph for Phaethon is in Propertian vein (*magnis tamen excidit ausis*, “even so, he failed in bold schemes,” *Met.* 2.328). Contrast *terret ambustus Phaethon avaras/spes*, “scorched Phaethon deters greedy hopes,” Hor., *Odes* 4.11.25–26. It is precisely in the next ode that Horace borrows from Euripides’ *Phaethon* (ed. Diggle, 63–78) to mourn his (and Propertius’) friend Virgil.

(and its perquisites), he was obliged by the terms of *amicitia* to put his patron's interests first among his concerns. This practice was early established among Rome's poets (Ennius/Africanus Maior). Even satirical Lucilius had been the *amicus* in this way of Scipio the Younger. There are many parallels in the works of Renaissance Italian painters, poets, and musicians. Outside Italy, one thinks of Shakespeare. As a member (from 1603) of an acting company known as the "King's Men," and *ex-officio* Groom of the Bedchamber, he actually wore a royal uniform on important occasions. The invoice disbursing the requisite material still survives.²² Does that devalue his poetry?

The Gygean Vision. Plato relates (*Rep.* 2.359d–360a) that Gyges looked through an underground window in a buried bronze horse to see a dead man wearing a magic ring of invisibility, evidently an old motif from folklore;²³ and this interior peering (rather than exterior, "objective" inspection) provides a convenient adjective for the Roman imagination. Virgil's Aeneas, for example, sees whatever happened on Troy's last night in the first place through the prism of his own inner, sympathetic sorrow: *quaeque ipse miserrima vidi*, "those most unhappy sights I saw myself," *Aen.* 2.5.

It is this inner world that Propertius also sees in that astonishing poem where he finds Cynthia drowning (*Vidi te* etc., 2.26)—exactly as, in a number of images, Picasso saw his Marie-Thérèse.²⁴ But what are we to think of Marcellus "drowning" (3.18.9)? This recurrence in itself suggests that the apparently "personal" vision of the poet, for all its subjectivity, is modified by inherited (and transmitted) archetypes that give it shape and meaning. And elsewhere too his poetry is filled with figures drawn from a world he did not create. "We follow paths already traced, and spend all our life embodying our 'now' in the forms we get from myth" (Thomas Mann).²⁵ The artist's genius is to possess this Gygean, shamanistic third eye. It is the evidence of this debt, rather than the pages of a diary, that must be looked for in a poet whose lines myth so loads.

²² A. Holden, *William Shakespeare* (Boston 1999), illustration on p. 208. In the "issue of cloth" accounts of the Master of the Great Wardrobe (1603) Shakespeare heads the list of players receiving each 4 1/2 yards of "scarlet red cloth."

²³ Pushkin's *Медный всадник* inevitably comes to mind: see my "Pushkin's 'Bronze Horseman' and the Epic Tradition", *Comparative Literature Studies* 9 (1972) 173–95.

²⁴ See the essay by Marilyn McCully, 'Boisgeloup, l'Olympe de Picasso', in: *Picasso Érotique* (Paris 2001) 138–53, especially 149–51.

²⁵ "Denn wir wandeln in Spuren, und alles Leben ist Ausfüllung mythischer Formen mit Gegenwart": *Joseph in Aegypten*, *Ges. Werke* 4 (1960) 819.

The Autobiographical (Documentary) Fallacy. Not even Cicero's speeches were legal documents, sworn statements of "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" (*Pro Cluentio* §139). Neither were Propertius' poems. We saw Philodemus re-asserting this point.

Sincerity. "Sincerity" is decreed nowadays to be *de rigueur* between the sexes. How can the slave of Cynthia's charms not then be "sincere," and in that case can he be telling fibs about either her or his own life? Poetry is not, however, concerned with that kind of sincerity. A poem is an artefact (*poema feci*, "I made a poem," Catullus 50.16), what the Formalists call a вещь, a "thing." It is sincere if it reflects the moral universe as it really is, i.e., if it does not pretend that vice is virtue, murder a convenient way of solving a problem, lust love: if it does not in the end lie about the human condition. Their refusal to do this is one of the reasons why Shakespeare's sonnets (and his poetry in general) are so admired.²⁶ Whether then the experiences described by the poet were always his, whether there really was one unique Cynthia, are improper enquiries (cf. Aristotle, *E. N.* 1098a 26–29). Due allowance must always be made for the power of the creative imagination, building with the aid of mirrors (Plato, *Rep.* 10.596d 9–10) the kaleidoscopic fragments of perception into what Yeats might have called "artifices of eternity."²⁷ On the other side, the closer the poet approximates to the journalist, the worse his poetry. And even journalists, struggling to secure for themselves the worst of two worlds, fabricate.

In 3.1, Propertius could not have appealed with any color to Callimachus, and still less to Philetas, if he had thought that the poet's job was to write the diary of an affair. He excludes the homoerotic element that Callimachus (*Epigr.* 42 and 46; cf. fr. 226, Πρὸς τοὺς Ὠραίους?) and other poets may have passed to Catullus (Juventius), Virgil (*Eclogue* 2), and Tibullus (1.4, 8, 9)—not to mention Horace (*Epode* 11). The epigram which Meleager had addressed to a boy ("Mosquito," *A.P.* 12.101) he modifies, as was noted, for the very first elegy of his *Cynthia*. The most "erotic" work of Callimachus he

²⁶ Sonnet 129 is worthy studying here: "Th' expense of spirit in a waste of shame/ Is lust in action; and till action, lust/Is perjured, murd'rous, bloody, full of blame" etc.

²⁷ "Gather me/Into the artifice of eternity," *Sailing to Byzantium* (1927; cf. *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats*, London 1952, 218). Yeats had his own love story to tell, but evidently his poetry too is more than the diary of an affair. So is that of Horace, to whose fourth book of *Odes* M. C. J. Putnam in 1986 applied the same Yeatsian image.

had as a model was probably then the *Acontius and Cydippe* episode from Book 3 of the *Aetia*. That confessed fiction even names a source.

Philetas of Cos, the other member of the duo, is said to have been so physically tiny that, when the etesian gales were blowing on his island, he had to weight his boots with lead to avoid being swept away!²⁸ Whatever he may have written in an erotic vein was not then perhaps too autobiographical. His best known poem in fact was in honor of Demeter.

Roman Love Elegy. "Love" elegy is not an exclusive genre. Neither Propertius nor Tibullus wrote in that way, and not Catullus before them or Ovid after them. All those great poets certainly wrote some amatory poems—which, in the case of Catullus, as in that of Callimachus, were not necessarily in elegiacs. In elegiacs they wrote also poems that are more general, as Ovid, to take these examples, lamented the deaths of a parrot (*Am.* 2.6)—or of Tibullus (*Am.* 3.9). It is telling that the poet who specifically placed his elegies under the inspiration of Amor (*Am.* 1.1) is precisely the one in whose Corinna no one believes.

In the case of Propertius, who wrote many wonderful poems that had little, if anything, to do with *eros*, to lump his elegies together under an exhaustive rubric of "love elegy" means in effect either to ignore many of those poems, or to disqualify them as irrelevant to the total achievement. They must be devalued because they were written "under duress," or were really "disguised sneers at authority." But have the contrivers of such theories understood the poet they profess to admire? Or his social matrix?

It is also wrong to speak of "Augustan" love elegy as if that adjective denoted merely a date. The Augustan poets strictly speaking were those grouped around Maecenas, and hence around the emperor, committed by that association to a certain program. Propertius was Augustan in this sense. He is the first author on record to salute the erstwhile Octavian by his new name (2.10.15).

Maecenas. Propertius' link with this extraordinary figure, with so much bounty to dispense, was matter for congratulation and envy, as Horace's remarks (*Sat.* 1.9.43ff.) suggest. Etruria had its own aesthetic. Etruscan Maecenas was what might loosely be called Octavian's

²⁸ F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (Leipzig 1891) I, 176 n. 13 (Athenaeus, Aelian). More seriously, Plutarch, *An seni*, 15.791 E.

Ministro dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali, a cultivated and polished diplomat, shrewd (and loyal) enough to be left in charge of affairs at Rome in 36 and again in 31–30 when Octavian was absent; yet “bohemian” in dress, affable and easy in manner, and even quite willing to pose as the long-suffering cuckold of a tempestuous wife by way of disarming critics of his high status. His poetry, rather reminiscent of Catullus’ manner, with its un-Roman hedonism, may be in the Etruscan vein (cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 11.732–40). It shows at least what the emperor was prepared to tolerate. Perhaps the stormy relationship with Terentia was the model for some of Propertius’ poems in that line (cf. 3.8, artfully preceding the address to Maecenas in 9).

Orality. Ovid supplies an essential clue to Propertius’ art: *saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes* (“Propertius, whose practice was to declaim his own loves,” *Tristia* 4.10.45). This confronts us with the unavoidable question of the poet’s presentation of his poems, which always presupposed the *viva vox* of the reciting actor. A literary work meant in this way for the ear rather than the eye (cf. Callimachus fr. 282) obeys different rules.²⁹ To buy a Propertian book of elegies was to acquire what on the modern music market might be called an “album.” It offered the record of its author’s public performances, *recitationes*. But, whatever its handsome dress may have been, in those pre-transistor, pre-computer days, it was still a poor second to the original. The modulations of the voice, perhaps aided, as in the case of Horace, by some sort of instrumental accompaniment; the proper savoring of alliteration and assonance; the histrionic “business” added by the facial expressions, looks, and hand movements of the gesticulating artist, who often perhaps glanced over to some object such as a sculpture or painting, or even courteously gestured toward someone in his audience, to illustrate his meaning; all the tricks now supplied by electronic gadgetry—these were then left to be reintroduced by the *sotto voce* of the muttering reader, someone trained (*doctus*) in the same essentially oral tradition of rhetoric, whose contribution to understanding was indispensable (cf. 2.13.11–12, *doctae, auribus . . . puris*, “refined ears”; τορὸν οὐαζ, “sharp ear,” *A.P.* 7.409.3–4; разборчивое ухо, “the analytic ear,” in Pushkin).³⁰

²⁹ Cf. the Formalist theory of the polyphonic сказ (“récit”), developed by Eichenbaum: Erlich (1955) 75, 238.

³⁰ From remarks made by Pushkin about his great predecessor G. Derzhavin: see Newman (1975) 333, n. 5.

Propertius then must always be thought of as engaging with his audience. The first elegy of 3 may supply an instance. Callimachus had disparaged the cart-track along which lumbered the wagons of poetic incompetence (*Aet.*-pref. 25–26). They would have been slow enough. Propertius tells his listeners that no wide avenue allows *quick* access to the Muses: *non datur ad Musas currere lata via* (“no Broad Street runs to the Muses,” 14). But the Via Lata in the Rome of his day was the start, and first urban section, of the Via Flaminia (221 BC), corresponding to the line of what is nowadays known as the Corso, running from the foot of the Capitoline (Piazza Venezia) to the Piazza del Popolo. And the Corso (with which we may compare Propertius’ *currere*) is so called because it was the street down which the young and wealthy of papal Rome raced (“coursed”) their horses during the carnival, as many visitors over the centuries, including Goethe and Dickens, have described. Perhaps there was some similar showing-off by the young (and bored?) *nobiles* in the poet’s time, as they sped north out of Rome’s tedium for their villas, and this would give his admonition extra pungency (cf. Juvenal 1.60–61). To make this point, he has adapted his Callimachean original to suit his audience.

Propertius nauta. The student of this book will note how often water imagery of one sort or another continues to haunt the poet’s imagination. Already in poem 2, Propertius parallels himself with Polyphemus, piping (unsuccessfully, as he knew from Theocritus) on the shore to attract the sea nymph Galatea. At the end, in 24, he is the survivor of a shipwreck (*naufragus*, 12).

In the ancient mentality, passing over the water is a symbol of death. This may well suggest how often the masculine poet feels the threat to his world from the unstable, ever-shifting element of the feminine; and show how much for him a line such as *quid me scribendi tam vastum mittis in aequor?* (“why send me out on such a mighty deep?” 9.3), apparently part of a conventional *recusatio*, is loaded with a meaning that Callimachus (who allegedly had never crossed the sea, fr. 178.33; cf. Terence, *Hec.* 419) does not care to explore. The πόντος (“sea”) of *Hy.* 2.106 is simply rejected. But Thanatos and Eros are close relatives, and Maecenas had a statue in his *horti* (now in the Capitoline Museums) which is interpreted as either.

Some Negatives. Callimachus’ poetic home, the Alexandrian Museum, housed φιλόσοφοι/φιλόλογοι, philosophers/philologists (Newman 2002–2003). There was something of the philosopher in Propertius, as his (Hesiodic, Aratean) promise (3.5) to treat of astronomy and

even eschatology confirms. In poem 21, he is proposing to study Plato and Epicurus (among other authors) in Athens. In different poems he plays with Empedocles' four elements to convey the dissolution of his chaotic world, for all its striving toward Love.

A first approach to the philological Propertius must be apophatic. The poet is not a professor, and that is not the meaning in the Latin poets of *doctus*. He is not an expert on Greco-Roman mythology or even history. He is not primarily concerned with logical consistency. He has of course enjoyed an excellent education, and learned a great deal by heart. He may occasionally have consulted a handbook of the sort Parthenius wrote for Gallus, or even, like Virgil (Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.17, 18), have asked him directly for advice. He had to impress a smart, ambitious, and cultivated audience, in which he particularly expected to find and appeal to women. His principal aim remained to amuse, to win applause and admiration for his verbal pirouettes, his romantic suggestiveness, his evocative use of proper names, his virtuosity with sound, the *frisson* of his alternative universe.

Propertius and the Sympotic/Carnival Style. A poetry under the patronage of Bacchus, seeking its origins in a dreaming vision, associating itself with the dance and music, with the unreal atmosphere of the party, with the liminal/littoral, with Love and Death, invites its hearers to view the prosaic truths of their reality through an unsettling looking glass. From this perspective, to see it as reportage denies its very essence. But it is more than satire. Rising into metaphysics, it subverts, with Arthur Rimbaud (see below), not a particular social setup, but sobriety's view of the human condition. How much more this is than Callimachus' εὖ δ'οῖνφ καίρια συγγελάσαι (*Epigr.* 35.2)!

* * *

Gedichtbücher did not for all that lack a principle of organization. If we accept the combination of its last two elegies into some sort of conceptual unity, if not into one continuous poem, Book 3 divides easily into thirds of eight poems apiece. Its ninth elegy addresses Maecenas, its seventeenth (where the initial *nunc* signals a transition) proclaims allegiance to Bacchus. Maecenas, spokesman for Propertius' grandest, if indirect, patron, allowed him to meet the Roman élite, and to share to some small extent even the emperor's confidence. Bacchus was the god of the *convivium* where these meetings would typically occur, the locale that this Apolline poet unexpectedly claimed

as his particular sphere (*nobis et Baccho et Apolline dextro*, “with both Bacchus and Apollo as my patrons,” 3.2.9).

Poems 1–5. This evident attention to order allows us to note the skill with which the five initial elegies are grouped to form a declaration of the Propertian poetic. Its author’s sensibility is Protean. There lurks in the background all the time an antithesis between venereal elegy and martial epic. Callimachus had opposed his type of carefully crafted poetry, not always composed in elegiacs, to sloppy Homerising pastiche, even if such pastiche was at the service of heroes and kings. He may be rejecting the *Smymeis* of Mimnermus, (ἡ μεγάλη . . . γυνή, “the big . . . woman,” *Aet.*-pref. 12), though that was written in elegiacs too. The Romans stereotyped this into an opposition between Mars and Venus. This already occurs in Lucretius’ proem. Propertius (or perhaps Gallus?), makes it into an opposition between metrical forms. In the proem to the *Amores*, as in the *Remedia Amoris* (373ff.), Ovid followed.

This antithesis will underlie the bold challenge of the first elegy, which finds the poet drawing a parallel between himself and Homer. Just as (hexametric) Homer’s fame grew posthumously, so will elegiac Propertius! Given the Hellenistic worship of Homer (Brink, 1972), evidenced, for example, in the Bovillae relief now in London (BM Sculpture 2191: late third century), this was, as he well knew, outrageous; and it is a good initial example of Propertian posturing/clowning, a theme more evident in the *risus eram* (“I was a laughing stock”) of 25.1. Here it is helped by the ambivalence of *armis* (1.29): “however Paris may have acquitted himself whether on the field or in bed.”

But if this premise supplies a subtext to the whole sequence of these first five poems, it does not of itself explain what Propertius writes. The poet, exploiting the Alexandrian code, is saying in essence:

Poem 1. Even though I accept Callimachean ideals of poetry (and therefore reject cyclic, flaccid, Ennian-style epic, which mistakenly purports to be in the Homeric tradition), nevertheless Homer is not the be-all and end-all (contrast the rueful ὅλως πάντεσσιν Ὅμηρος, “Homer is enough for all,” Theocr. 16.20). There is room for a successor. He and I in fact have something in common. We both write immortal poetry, even if, like him, I must wait for an appreciative audience. Homer already had that audience! Propertius is making a staggering assertion of the claim and ambition of the un-Homeric contemporary.

Poem 2. My poetry is “cyclic” too in its way (*orbem*, 2.1): but its cycle is that of my *puella*. I am in the (vatic) company of Orpheus

and Amphion (cf. Horace, *A.P.* 392, 394)—and in that of (comic, buffoonish) Polyphemus!³¹ I am a poor poet. But my *ingenium* will outlast all the great monuments of the mighty: not so much then “you will live” (e.g., Theognis 237–54; cf. Shakespeare, Sonnet 55) as “I will live” (Egyptian scribes; Horace, *Odes* 3.30).

Poem 3. My choice against conventional epic poetry was confirmed by a vision of Apollo and the Muses, whose spokeswoman was Calliope, already perhaps (cf. 4.6.12) Epic’s own Muse (with v. 38 here cf. Philodemus’ μουσοπρόσωπος, “with the face of a Muse,” *A.P.* 9.570.1). I am a water drinker in the tradition of Philetas. So much then for Bacchus!

Had Dante seen this poem (v. 22 ~ *Purg.* 1.2)? Arthur Rimbaud, whose *Le Bateau ivre* (1871) might have appealed to Propertius *nauta*, surely echoes it in a youthful effusion in hexameters (1868).³²

Poem 4. But I can write eulogistic epic after all, though in elegiacs! Even so, I do not compromise my own loyalty to my *cara puella*. Are these echoes from Mimnermus? Cf. Horace, *Epp.* 2.2.100–01.

Poem 5. And—since that too falls within elegy’s purview—I can write moralizing satire on human pretensions that must all end in death. In my old age, I may even write something in the Aratean/Hesiodic (epic) manner approved by Callimachus. That excuses me from military service to recover Crassus’ standards. (He feels then the need to make an excuse!)

In spite of his modesty, the poet has a genuine epic sense of the grand, notable in elegies 3 and 4. Unexpectedly, resonantly, it is heard in his pentameters. Perhaps here he was most the disciple of the *Smyrneis*. In itself, the elegiac meter is after all unsuited to epic, since its effect is to lame the majestic sweep of heroic, hexameter verse. This is why Archilochus likes it. The initial hexameter of each couplet begins as if it were to make that sort of lofty statement, the

³¹ Another hint of the poet’s fascination with the littoral. At the end of Theocritus 11, Polyphemus in fact discovered that song could “shepherd,” almost “tame,” love—a valuable skill! Perhaps the Roman poet is claiming it for himself. See further Newmans (2004) 68.

³² *Ver erat, et Romae morbo languebat inertis/Oribilius* etc. (“It was springtime, and back in Rome teacher was sick and weak”). The 14-year-old poet dreams he is carried aloft by Venus’ doves (cf. Prop. 3.3.31; Virgil, *Aen.* 6.190), and then receives a lyre from Phoebus himself, while the god traces in letters of fire on his brow the inscription “Tu vates eris” (“You will be an inspired poet;” cf. *vates . . . magnus ero*, Prop. 2.10.19–20). A vision of the Muses follows, exactly the epiphany/commission sequence of elegy 3.3. See Giampietro Marconi (1998) 103–04.

impression continues into the first hemistich of the next line, and then suddenly the rhythm loses its way and cheats the expectant ear by repeating itself. Ovid exploits this (*Am.* 1.9.1–2; cf. *Ars* 1.536–37, *Rem.* 385–86, and the medieval *versus reciproci* [Eberhardus Germanus, *Laborintus* 765–70; Faral, 1924, pp. 363–64]); and the same impression is exaggerated by the dactylo-epitrite, invented perhaps by Pindar. Propertius characteristically uses proper names to convey the “sound gesture” (to use a Formalist term) made by the pentameter, so that instead of a let-down it becomes a climax (*vix timeat salvo Caesare Roma Iovem*, 3.11.66). Sometimes a telling common noun will serve as well (the repeated *ingenio* in 2.25 and 26).

He darts in and out among his Alexandrian symbols like some shining fish in a clear pool; and for a sophisticated audience that is part of the quicksilver charm (ποικίλον κιθαρίζων, “strumming every which way,” Pindar, *Nem.* 4.14) of his allusive style (φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν, “speaking to the intelligent,” *Ol.* 2.85). What emerges to the modern critic’s sober eye is certainly evidence of his self-confidence, but also of his commitment to the patronage of the court, most visible in his quotation from Gallus at 4.10 (*Romanae . . . historiae*, Gallus, fr. 3.2, Buechner; cf. *Latiae consulis historiae*, Sulpicius Carth. apud Don., *Vita Verg.* §38). He may have been flatteringly describing some grotto in the Horti Maecenatis at 3.25–36. But, for all its conventionality of expression, we must not doubt either the good faith of Propertius’ commitment to a vocation. Like Horace (*Odes* 3.1.3), he is a *sacerdos* (1.3).

Horace permits an occasional wry smile; Propertius does not exclude even laughter from his temple. He is also an entertainer, always willing to guy himself in order to amuse the convivial company. His pretensions often skirt the absurd. He feels that too.

Poems 6–8. After the initial elaboration of a poetic, these pieces aim to illustrate the poet’s skill in manipulating his voices: the comic; the satirical-reflective; the erotic.

Poem 6 is a monologue worthy of Menander, but clearly also a mime, and to that extent the poet’s way of revealing the fictional base of his whole amatory enterprise. The young lover, never identified, is evidently sorry that he quarrelled with his mistress, also never named, and has sent a trusted servant, Lygdamus (he is named), to find out how she is feeling. Lygdamus alas never gets to make his report. The lover imagines a sentimental scene in which his weeping girl is sadly working at her wool in the midst of her servants—more

perhaps like Gretchen am Spinnrade than Lucretia. She entrusts Lygdamus, still in fancy, with a message of rebuke and revenge. Her rival has prevailed only by the use of magic. Fired by this wholly imaginary news, the tormented lover instructs the servant to return immediately with his terms of surrender, promising him freedom if he brings about a reconciliation. This is a scene from a *comédie larmoyante*, a sentimental piece by a master of gentle humor. Proust's picture of love as self-deception exploits on a larger scale the same vein.

As a genre, elegy may also be a poetry of reflection on life's ups and downs, as Theognis, for example, shows. At Rome, such reflection easily passes into satire, and that is what *poem 7* contains (*sollicitae . . . vitae*, "care-ridden life," v. 1 = Hor., *Sat.* 2.6.62; *Pecunia*, v. 1 = Hor., *Epp.* 1.6.37. The *Du-Stil* of vv. 1–7 demands the capital from editors in Propertius too). Paetus has drowned on some voyage where he was looking for profit, οὐ κατὰ τοῦτ' ἐλθὼν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐμπορίαν ("not on this errand, but on business," Simonides, 2.138 Diehl). The theme, in essence at least, was already Hesiodic (*Erga* 618–94). Propertius retails with gusto and due commiseration the circumstances of his watery death. At the end, he promises never to make such a voyage himself (cf. *Erga* 646ff., where Hesiod has sailed only a short distance [65 meters]) and that to enter a poetry competition; Callimachus, fr. 178.33).

Poem 8, another monologue, celebrates the wilder side of love. It begins by recalling some violent scene between the speaker and a mistress at a drunken party, and passes into reflection on the superiority of such emotion to more passive affection. Paris and Helen offer the desirable model (cf. *Iliad* 3.421ff.). More homage here to Homer as Propertius' twin.

Poems 9–16. These poems offer a series of virtuoso pieces in different moods. Augustan "official" notes (9, 11, 12) are heard among lighter themes.

With his address to Maecenas in *poem 9*, he again returns to the proclamation of his literary allegiance: *inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos* ("enough for me to please among Callimachus' scrolls," 43). Immodestly, he parallels his own modesty with that of his patron—a jester's licence. He has of course no intention of writing formal epic, but his skill in suggesting what he might do in other circumstances is tantalizing. Horace, no epicist either, toys more persuasively with similar pretences (*Epp.* 2.1.250ff.).

Haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas, / meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant ("Let my poems kindle both boys and girls. / Let them call

me a god, and make offerings to me," 45–46) gives a good idea of the poet's intended listeners, and the "pop-star" effrontery of his designs on their feelings. The second *urant* here again illustrates the effective use of the single-word fourth-foot spondee.

Vindolanda has reminded us of the importance to Roman ladies of birthdays, and *poem 10* is a beautiful celebration of such an occasion. Cynthia is assumed to be the addressee, but she is not mentioned. The poem anyway begins with a vision and is filled with wishful subjunctives. Such vagueness both distances our sense of immediate experience, and allows any one of the *turba puellarum* to substitute herself. Does it forecast the tone of 4.7?

Poem 11 was noted above. It is disguised as self-criticism, but is actually aimed at making a strong political statement of the emperor's view of himself as the guardian of Republican glories and (like Pompey) pacifier of pirate threats (cf. Hor., *Odes* 4.5.19).³³

Poem 12 reproves Postumus for leaving his charming wife Aelia Galla for the dangerous campaign in Parthia. There is consolation. She is as faithful as Penelope, whose husband Ulysses' wanderings are dutifully catalogued. For this recruiting poster, Propertius adds to his *Iliads* an *Odyssey*.

Poem 13 begins with satire on the greedy ways of Roman girls with favors for sale (cf. Lucretius 4.1121ff.). They are examples of a society in which everything is going to the dogs. Rome itself is cracking under the burden of its own prosperity, an Augustan leitmotif pioneered by Horace (*Epodes* 16.2), echoed in Seneca (*Const. Sap.* 2.2), and picked up by Lucan (1.72). A Golden Age and its rustic simplicities are contrasted, perhaps with a reminiscence (v. 41) of the *Georgics* (*dique deaeque omnes*, "all you gods and goddesses," 1.21), with the gold-fever of the present. Yet, by way of a graceful hint that something of traditional culture is still left on the part of reciter and audience, the poet translates an epigram by the unnamed Leonidas of Tarentum (*A.P.* 9.337) into his text (43–46; cf. Hor., *Sat.* 1.2.120–22, where, however, the name of Philodemus is actually given). A good example

³³ *Vix timeat salvo Caesare Roma Iovem* (66; cf. *salva*, 50) picks up the theme of identification of emperor and city, visible, for example, on the Gemma Augustea (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum). See the much longer discussion of this poem in Newman (1997) 255–62, where the division into 28, 28, 14, and 2 lines is noted (*at tu* at 71 here = "Endapostrophe," Abel (1930) 92. Is this also a Pindaric trick of style?).

of the serio-comic style, as it is shown by the parallels it offers at 11 with Pater Benedictus Chelidonius' *In sacrarum aedium contaminatores*, no. 6 in the series of poems he wrote to accompany Albrecht Dürer's so-called *Kleine Passion* of 1511.³⁴ The monk had no love-life!

Poem 14 is another spoof. Horace uses *Lacedaemonium Tarentum* (*Odes* 3.5.56) to sum up the heroic bravery of Regulus, leaving to face his Carthaginian torturers as nonchalantly as if he were going for a holiday—but a Spartan holiday. Propertius too wishes we could revive those austere old ways. After all, look how the Spartan girls took their exercise! This may be contrasted with some rather intense lines from an anonymous tragedy (*inc. trag.* 206–08 R., apud Cic., *T. D.* 2.§36): <nihil horum similest> apud Lacaenas virgines, / quibus magis palaestra Eurota sol pulvis labor / militia studio est quam fertilitas barbara.³⁵ Propertius' Augustan poem suppresses the objection to fertility. Its emphasis on free love, striking a more relaxed note, hints that it is another piece aimed at the *turba puellarum*, not so much guying male lust as playing to women's desire to show off their bodies (cf. Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.101–102; Eubulus comicus, fr. 67 K., adduced *ad loc.* by R. Heinze).

Poem 15 shows how little credence we may place on *Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit* ("Cynthia began it all, Cynthia will end it," 1.12.20). There was already Lycinna, perhaps an equivalent of Horace's Cinara. "You must not be jealous of her" he says to her (unnamed) successor. Sexual jealousy is indeed a powerful motif, as Euripides' *Medea* attests, but here the thought provides an occasion for retailing the fate of Dirce, and the bloody revenge exacted from her, not by maltreated Antiope, but by Amphion and Zethus.³⁶ Are they stand-ins for the poet? One hopes not!

³⁴ *Matrona incedit census induta nepotum / et spolia opprobrii nostra per ora trahit* ("the matron minces forth in an outfit that has cost the fortunes of her lovers, and flaunts before our faces the spoils of her shame"), Propertius, vv. 11–12; ~ *et, matrona levis, spatiosa sub ora virorum, / exornata nimis . . . / omnia venalem portans per templa pudorem* ("and you, giddy matron, stepping out under the gaze of the men, dressed fit to kill . . . hawking your honor through all the temples"), Chelidonius, vv. 11–13. Cf. *The Little Passion by Albrecht Dürer* (Bodoni, Verona 1971) for an English translation by Robert Fitzgerald (p. 167).

³⁵ "<Nothing like this> among the girls of Sparta. The wrestling ground, the swim, the sun, the dust, the workout, the soldier's life: these things are more their concern than the child-breeding of foreign women."

³⁶ The "Toro Farnese," now in Naples, was originally put on display at Rome by the poet's contemporary Asinius Pollio (Pliny, *N. H.* 36.33–34). Had Propertius seen it?

The sea imagery at vv. 31–34 is extraordinary, and may find a parallel in a well-known poem of the English High Victorian author and critic Matthew Arnold.³⁷

Cruentantur later (41) is barbarous, but one may distantly compare Virgil on the punishment of Mettius Fufetius (8.642–45), for which Livy apologizes (1.28.11). Perhaps it is owed to the same Roman taste that enjoyed the mimic *Laureolus* (Suetonius, *Cal.* 57.4). Propertius is sentimental, but evidently sentiment does not exclude cruelty.³⁸

Poem 16 describes the dramatic arrival in Rome in the middle of the night of a letter from his mistress, commanding his presence at Tivoli. Dare he go? Dare he not go? The theme of the invulnerability of the lover, shared with Tibullus (1.2.27), is developed at some length. The poem functions as a contrast with what is now to come.

Poems 17–24 (25?), signalling the end of the collection, sound also an insistent note of breakup with Cynthia, indicating the poet's decision to end his formal career. Perhaps he looked forward to a return to Assisi (where his splendid house is said to lie under S. Maria Maggiore: Strazzulla, 1985, pp. 77–81; Annibali, 1995, p. 21), and to some sort of family life. Once again, there may be a parallel with Shakespeare, and that sonneteer's return to Stratford, his family, and his New Place.

The opening hymn to Bacchus (poem 17) might be expected to be a defiant call to ignore established rules of decorum (*me iuvat et multo mentem vincire Lyaeo*, "my pleasure is in fettering the mind with deep draughts," 3.5.21). But this is Horace's *verecundus Bacchus* ("shamefast Bacchus," *Odes* 1.27.3), and instead the poem oddly seeks the help of the god in putting an end to the poet's *servitium*. If he does that, his reward will be a treatment of his many adventures, a program that later Nonnus of (Egyptian) Panopolis would develop in forty-eight books of carnival epic.

There follows an epicedion (poem 18) for the young M. Claudius Marcellus, dead in 23 BC. It ends (34) with an allusion to C. Julius Caesar, one of only two in the entire corpus (cf. 4.6.59).³⁹ In such

³⁷ Cf. "Dover Beach" (1867) 8–14. He traces the image to Sophocles.

³⁸ "Он был зол и sentimentalен" ("he was malicious and sentimental"), Dostoevsky, *Братъ я Карамазовы* (repr. Paris 1946) I, p. 33.

³⁹ The only possible parallel for *humana . . . via* at the end is apparently supplied by Augustine, Psalm 118, sermo 8 par. 1: *quia tentatio est via humana super terram* (vita Migne). I am grateful to Dr. Dietfried Krömer, formerly of the TLL, and Dr. Manfred Flieger, Geschäftsf. Sekretär at the TLL Office in Munich, for their generous help

company, this was surely then an “official” poem, more than simply a token of private grief.

The absence of the honorand’s name is an extraordinary poetic ploy, and hardly parallel with the absence of Cynthia’s name from other pieces. Does the occasion for which it was composed supply an explanation? The statue of the dead man, by Cleomenes of Athens (now in the Louvre), was modeled after the Hermes commemorating the Athenian dead at Chaeroneia, proof that it too was officially commissioned, and intended to reinforce the notion of Augustus and his family as defenders of liberty (Cleopatra/Philip of Macedon theme: cf. 11.39–40, and *libera signa*, 4.6.62). The statue is attributed by art historians already to 23. Is it possible that there was some sort of unveiling ceremony before the emperor and imperial circle at which Propertius recited his tribute, so that in such a dominant marble presence the name of the deceased was quite unnecessary? *Hic* (v. 9) would then be the pronoun, signaling a gesture.

The presence of this poem here matches elegiac Propertius with epic Virgil (*Aen.* 6.860–86).

A further extraordinary feature is that, on a surface reading, the piece seems to suggest that the young man was actually drowned at Baiae (v. 9). That was not so. The watery images that multiply in these lines are yet another recurrence of the tic that makes Propertius’ sobriquet of *nauta* so appropriate.

Empedocles’ elements are well in evidence: water (*aquae*, 2); earth (*harena*, 3); fire (*ignibus*, 20); air (*animae*, 32, but see also the *fluitantia vela* at 13, of the resurrecting theatre). This cosmic schematism lends greater resonance to the familiar commonplaces of the genre.

Poem 19 uses a satiric topos, the lustfulness of women (cf. Juvenal VI), to launch into a parade of mythical *exempla*. In rehearsing his expected gambits, how little Propertius cares about novelty, sincerity, and the rest of these modern desiderata! He wants the music and rhetoric of his poetry to be heard!⁴⁰

here. Et tamen textum traditum recte me iudice recipit Fedeli. An idioma Aegyptiacum, a Gallo fortasse desumptum, vel Semitismus est (= Hebraice *derekh ish* = “der Gang der Menschen”)? Vide Botterweck/Ringgren (1977). Ac testatur Koch in col. 303: “In zwei Psalmen wird *derekh* auf das Tun und Verhalten des Königs bezogen.” This would especially suit Propertius’ allusion to Caesar.

⁴⁰ <Poesis> *nichil aliud est . . . quam fictio rethorica musicaque poita* (“Poetry is nothing except a fiction made out of rhetoric and music”), Dante, *Vulg. Elog.* 2.4.

There follows (poem 20) a most beautiful (and excited) elegy of invitation to a girlfriend to give up her hopes of loyalty from an unfaithful lover and instead seek consolation with Propertius. Evidently this at least cannot be Cynthia. The poem's language and sequence of thought, naturally enough, betray unusual agitation. It should therefore be left as a single poem, with minimal editorial intervention.

At the very outset, only Propertius *nauta's* labile imagination could have visualized (v. 2) the traitor's departure from his mistress' bed in terms of Theseus sailing away from Ariadne, without actually spelling that out!

Fingis (v. 5) is a fine example of the poet's maddening looseness of expression. He knows that there has been deception, and this for him is the key point, not to be let go of. It was the lover who "made up" (as it turns out, false) appeals to the gods and "invented" empty words pledging commitment. The thought is so important that the verb persists even when the poet is addressing the girl who was deceived. Now it must be given a somewhat different twist. "Foolish girl, you *concoct* scenes when he swore by the gods, you *concoct* words which in the event prove to have been empty." She consoles herself with self-deception, no doubt even attributing to her lost lover oaths and language that he never actually used. Mutual lies end in one-sided disappointments. Aeneas' answer to Dido's recriminations may be compared (*ne finge*, *Aen.* 4.338).

Lines 11 and 12 should be left in their place. The topoi of the *aubade* (*Tagelied*, "Song of Two Lovers forced to part by Dawn") naturally begin with a complaint to the sun's harbinger, dawn, and why not to the sun himself?⁴¹ Propertius has been thinking of the *puella* (10). His imagination leaps ahead to thoughts of a too-early end to the night of love that he will only bother to mention at v. 13. Accordingly, with *tu quoque* (11), he immediately turns his attention to Phoebus.

Aras and *sacra marita* ("altars," "rites of wedlock," 25–26) extend the guarantees of marriage to a union that is not marriage—and then *argutae . . . historiae* and *dominae* ("shrill gossip," "mistress," 28–29) undercut that Catullan pretence.

⁴¹ There are many examples: see Gow/Page (1965) II, p. 622 on Meleager 27 (= *A.P.* 5.172), "Ὅρθρε τί μοι δυσέραστε, κτλ: "Unlovely dawn, what are you doing here?"; *quo properas, Aurora?* Ovid, *Am.* 1.13.3 ("What's your hurry, Dawn?"); "O cruel day," Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde* 3.1.450; "Day... morn," Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* 3.5.1, 6.

Nox . . . prima (13) supplies the clearest proof that we are no longer to think of Cynthia. We are not specifically told who this girl was. Propertius is placating the *turba puellarum* by offering them hope: not, of course, of sexual favors, but of a poem they could pass off as referring to themselves.

In *poem 21*, Propertius is “compelled” to leave for Athens to find a cure for his love—another sea trip for the *nauta*. The list of Greek classics he proposes to study there gives us some clue to where we should look for the sources of his poetry: Plato, Epicurus, Demosthenes, Menander. Plato (also an elegist) found a heavenly meaning in *eros*, and that is what his poems about love have meant for Propertius—the service in the end, not of Cynthia, but of Calliopea (3.2.16; 3.38). Epicurus, as we see from Lucretius’ satire at the end of Book 4, was against the disturbance caused by sexual adventure, and here for Propertius’ poetry the already noted Theocritean concept of ποιᾶν τὸν ἔρωτα (“to tend my love,” *Id.* 11.80), song as remedy, comes into play (Newmans 2004 59, n. 21). Epicurus was also the guiding spirit of Philodemus (cf. *A.P.* 11.44), as Cicero’s *In Pisonem* (§70) makes clear. Demosthenes represents the rhetorical tradition that the poet knows how to exploit so richly (and cf. elegy 18.25–26 with *or.* 18 [*De Corona*] §97). Menander teaches the comedy of character, man’s infatuation with self-disquiet, *Hauton Timoroumenos*.

Poem 22 is more official. It represents the first time the poet has addressed his first patron since Book 1, the now famous “Cynthia.” There is the opportunity to rehearse *laudes Italiae* in Virgil’s wake, and to point out the plain duty of an Augustan *nobilis*: public service, marriage, children. How amusing to find the poet assuming the role of *patruus*, elder statesman, in this way. What a contrast with 1.1. Was this too an “official” piece?

Poem 23 signals, but with a light touch, the coming end. The poet humorously reports the loss of his writing tablets, used for his assignments. He advertises for their return, but, if some avaricious miser has found them, will he ever get them back?

Poems 24 and 25, different aspects of the same thought, are “farewell” poems (compare [and contrast] Shakespeare’s “Farewell: thou art too dear for my possessing,” Sonnet 87). They bid good-bye to the girl who has proved unworthy—although of course the record of her unworthiness is owed entirely to the satirical poet. The first piece, somewhat in the vein of Catullus 76, has more dignity than the second, which vindictively underlines the ugly fate that awaits Cynthia’s

beauty in old age. This is an iambic topos open to elaboration in many ways. Herrick's was one: "Gather ye rosebuds while ye may. . . ." And how gracefully, for example, Plato, without any masculine "I told you so," allows retiring Lais to dedicate her mirror to Aphrodite (I, no. 15, Diehl). Propertius has anticipated or imitated a Horatian treatment (*Odes* 4.13; cf. 1.25; 3.15), and his poem is none the better for that.

* * *

Lessons of Book 3. Already in Greece, the elegy catered to mixed tastes, those of the funeral and of the symposium, of love and battle. At its very outset, Archilochus stamped it with the fervor of the political partisan and soldier of fortune. Tyrtaeus and Solon in their different ways used it for national, patriotic purposes. Theognis showed it could be used to criticize social degeneration: χρήματα γὰρ τιμῶσι, "money is all they respect" (189).

When elegy was borrowed by the Romans, an amorphous genre taken into a new context, where it could not hope to find the clear limits it never possessed, it inevitably had its satiric dimension reinforced by the national mindset. But Roman satire, like Hebrew prophecy, has a double aspect. On the one hand, it may certainly cut down to size the pretensions of the vainglorious. But it is also looking for a redeeming figure, a messiah, someone such as Ennius' Africanus Maior (cf. Cic., *T. D.* V. 17. §49). This is why it is wrong to bring to bear on Propertius' poems a lens sensitive only to one end of their spectrum. His messiah is Augustus.

On the evidence then of this book alone, how much Propertius' richness is impoverished if we reduce his art and scope to the story of an affair! His literary ambition (fostered by study of Pindar?) is patent. At the outset, we saw him defining his poetic in Callimachean terms. That he shared to some extent with Catullus and perhaps even with Gallus. But, conscious of his own bountiful talent, he manipulates the terms of the Alexandrian code in an imperious and contradictory way that makes his contemporary Horace, for example, seem orthodox and stylized. Certainly, Propertius, like the Alexandrian elegists, like Arnaut Daniel, is the master of a *dolce stil novo* (Dante, *Purg.* 24.57). But, for him, official epic is no longer quite the enemy of modern poetry that it was thought to have been in the Museum. Now, in Augustus' heady days, with Virgil already at work on "something greater than the *Iliad*" (2.34.66), laudatory epic can no longer be dismissed as trite hackwork; and in case we think this is mere insurance

of the kind Ovid so singularly failed to take out, the poet seizes many opportunities to offer a practical demonstration of his own epic powers. Even Callimachus had experimented with a revived epic in his *Hecale* and *Galatea*. In his polemical *Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην*, he had praised epic Aratus as πολυμαθὴ καὶ ἄριστον ποιητὴν ("a learned and excellent poet," fr. 460; cf. *Epigr.* 27). Propertius promised something in that Hesiodic vein too.

To understand some of this literary complexity grants insight into a major question: is the poet to be thought of as a rather dissolute partygoer with a gift for knocking off verses, who stupidly made himself the slave of a sometimes gratifying, but often uncertain and unrewarding *cocotte*; or was he rather a conscious artist creating a comedy on whose stage he deployed both his own ego and that of the characters he devised in order to amuse, enlighten, and entertain? Proust argued that the observer and recorder of the bourgeoisie is, by his very objectifying act of detaching himself, no longer bourgeois. And if Propertius was the observer and recorder of the party scene? He certainly seems to offer us a clue to his art in the mime of elegy 6.

But he did more than entertain. He loves to speak of "Caesar" and "Augustus." In grandiose lines he celebrates, for example, the proposed expedition by a second Alexander to recover Crassus' standards (*Indos*, 3.4.1, cited above; cf. *India quin, Auguste, tuo dat colla triumpho*, "India herself bends her neck to Augustus' yoke," 2.10.15). We have also spoken of his need to foster the relationship he had acquired with so exalted a patron as Maecenas. He did this in an elegy (3.9) that flattered his patron's modesty and cleverly used that modesty as a pattern which could excuse his own "refusal" to venture on loftier genres. The question arises whether Maecenas was actually pressing Propertius toward such commissions, or whether in fact Propertius is simply taking a moment to show off. Is there a compromise? The main pressure, one guesses, was exercised, not so much by any patron, as by the poet's sense of the excitement and grandeur of the new, Augustan Rome. To this he responded as he was best able, with what show he could muster, and his *recusationes* may be compared/contrasted with those of Horace. The epic demand as such was being catered to by Virgil, but not perhaps under real compulsion either.⁴²

⁴² In spite of *tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa*, *Geo.* 3.41. An example of real compulsion may perhaps be sought in Michelangelo's stormy relationship with Julius II (cf.

“Defining a poetic self.” To do this for Propertius, the student must take an overview of Book 3 as a whole, rather than privilege any particular poem or poems. Does the book as a totality give the impression of a poet robbed of all controlling artistry by a crazy passion (*furor*)?⁴³ Losing his touch as he chafed under the militarism and bellicosity of a brutally dictatorial regime? Making covert fun of its pretensions? Even if Propertius had been such an ingrate, what a curious thought anyway that in the modern classroom, with its inevitably tenuous grasp of the Latin language and its underlying psychology, of Roman *amicitiae* and their shifting contours, we can detect this persistent *double entendre*, while Maecenas or Augustus, native speakers, shrewd and even ruthless politicians, were oblivious to it. In the end, Propertius remains one of Rome’s boldest and “energetic” (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.1411b 25; cf. ἐνεργότατος, Callimachus, *Aet.* I, fr. 1.40) writers, self-consciously brilliant, an intensely polished jewel in the Augustan crown (2.10.21–22).

Sonnets 3 and 5, Guasti). But who will fault the art that emerged from that partnership? Stalin’s tougher patronage produced Stalin’s art.

⁴³ Not, of course, of a “loving human being,” since *furor*, the token of the melancholic genius ([Aristotle], *Problemata* 30.1), is too serious for that kind of mawkishness. Book 3 tells us there may also be a *furor patriae . . . utilis* (13.65); cf. *atque utinam patriae sim verus haruspex*, *ibid.* 59.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE FOURTH BOOK

Hans-Christian Günther

Introduction

At first sight Propertius' last book of elegies comprises a puzzling mixture of aetiological elegies on Roman topics—looking forward to Ovid's *Fasti*—with others seemingly in line with his own previous love poetry. This diversity of topic and style has induced some scholars to suspect that the book was put together after the poet's death by someone else from his 'Nachlass';¹ it has even been claimed that it is not the work of Propertius at all.² However, to regard the Propertius, even of Books 1–3, exclusively as a poet of love is far too restricted a view. On a closer look, the juxtaposition of Roman aetiological poems and amatory compositions is much less surprising than it may first appear.³

There is surely *some* conscious structural arrangement of the poems in the fourth book. This need not mean necessarily that this structure goes back to Propertius himself. A compiler probably would also have arranged the poems in some rational way. However, it can be shown that the arrangement of the poems reflects a well-thought-out 'program' for a poetry book combining and interweaving 'personal' and national compositions, a program in full accord with tendencies inherent in Propertius' poetic development from Books 1 and 2 to the ever greater prominence of Roman topics and

¹ See Fedeli (1965) p. XIIIff.; cf. also Weeber (1977) 8ff. and Komp (1988) 183ff.

² Cf. Heimreich (1864–1867) 673ff. who regarded all but perhaps 4.11 as spurious; successively Herrmann (1951) 137ff. condemned the whole book; cf. also Zwierlein (1999) 7 n. 1. The authenticity has already been defended in the still important study of Reisch (1887) 123ff., who argued for a posthumous collection.

³ Regarding language and style, see Tränkle (1960), in particular pp. 140f., 175ff. on 4.5 and pp. 104, 178f. on 4.8.

the transformation of love poetry itself in the third book.⁴ A correct appreciation of the poetry of Propertius' last book rests 1) on an adequate understanding of the poet's program, announced in the introductory poems (1a and 1b) and in the second prooemium, 4.6, and 2) on the interpretation of the single elegies with a view toward their place in the whole of the book.⁵ Thus it may be helpful to preface a few general remarks.⁶

There is little evidence for dating single poems,⁷ and for 1a, too, this is *terminus post* (the *aedes Quirini*, referred to in l. 9, was dedicated 16 BC; the theatre of Marcellus, probably hinted at in l. 15, was dedicated 13 BC, but it need not have been completed by the time the poem was written). 4.6 and 11, both occupying a prominent position in the book, were probably commissioned for a specific occasion, and the rest of the book seems to be built around them (similarly to Horace's fourth book of the *Odes*). Thus, the book may have been published not very long after 16 BC, already leaving a rather long interval after the publication of the third book in 22 BC.

If one accepts the division of the first poem into 1a and b (see below p. 358) the book neatly falls into two halves (1a/b-5, 6-11),

⁴ For the political significance of Augustan poetry cf. Griffin (1984) and Kienast (1992) 225ff. with further references.

⁵ Apart from the standard bibliographies on Propertius (see Manuwald p. 220 n. 5 in this volume), a short bibliography on single poem can be found in Hanslik's edition and Weeber (1977); some of the more important recent contributions are cited below. If not stated otherwise, I rely on Goold's Loeb text. In some more controversial places there is a textual note, but, in view of the limited space, there is no room for discussion; Goold (1967, 1987, 1989, 1992) and Heyworth (1986b, 1999) should always be compared; other more recent contributions are cited occasionally.

⁶ For the structure of Propertius' fourth book Grimal's (1953) ingenious study is still of great value, although his overall view on the structure of the book with (eleven) poems symmetrically corresponding to each other (50) is unconvincing; Dieterich's (1900) 220f. scheme is in outline correct; cf. also Günther (1997a) 152ff.; an instructive survey of the older literature is found in Fedeli (1965) *loc. cit.*. Relatively recent important treatments of the book's unity and purpose are Hutchinson (1984) and Butrica (1996) 145ff., and one may also compare Burck (1966b) and Pilliger (1969). But the most important treatment of the book as a whole with an interpretation of the single poems with view to their significance in this whole is still Becker (1971).

⁷ Cf. Fedeli (1965, XXIIIff.); only the sixth and the eleventh elegy can be dated with reasonable certainty to *ca.* 16 BC (see Fedeli, *loc. cit.*; 4.3 need not necessarily be dated before 20 BC, because a Parthian campaign is mentioned in l. 35f.; see Becker (1971, 470).

marked by a new programmatic poem at the beginning of the second half. The most apparent principle of arrangement is that of *variatio*, i.e. 'Roman' aetiological and erotic poems alternate, either individually or in pairs: first half: a pair of introductory poems, 1a/b, then aetiological and erotic poems alternate individually; second half: one pair of elegies on Cynthia (7/8) and one pair of aetiological elegies (9/10), framed by a programmatic aetiological poem (6) and a poem (11) that most overtly combines topics of love poetry with praise of Roman values.⁸

The twofold structure and content of the book is announced in two programmatic elegies, 1a and 1b: 1a announces the aetiological poems; 1b forms a kind of ironic mock-*recusatio* and thus announces the erotic compositions. In fact, the twofold content and the double introduction has a close parallel in the fourth book of Horace's *Carmina*:⁹ Horace's book is prefaced by three program poems (4.1–3): 1 introduces love poetry, 2 (a kind of anti-*recusatio*) introduces the panegyric poems.¹⁰

Regarding Propertius, 4.1a and b must be read with reference to the program poems of Book 2 and those of Book 3 in particular: as I have shown elsewhere,¹¹ the concluding poem of the third book, 3.24/25 (to be regarded as one poem), is not an unqualified farewell to love poetry in general, but rather to a particular type of love poetry, i.e., the love poetry hitherto practiced by Propertius (and already partially transformed and abandoned in Book 3) with its emphasis on the great emotion for and the exclusive devotion to one woman. Accordingly, though 1b is surely meant to be ironic, it does not exclude erotic poetry from the poet's program, but rather announces a new kind of erotic poetry—i.e., one that mirrors the poet's earlier love poetry from an ironic distance, and indeed one may regard the erotic poems of Book 4 as a kind of self-interpretation by the poet.¹²

⁸ On the arrangement of Augustan poetry books, see Port (1926), Michelfeit (1969); regarding division into two equal halves marked by a second prooemium, cf., e.g., Virgil's *Bucolics* or Horace's first book, of *Satires*; for programmatic poems in the middle of a book, cf. also Conte (1996). The sequence of poems in Propertius' fourth book is carefully conceived, as will be shown in the interpretation of the single poems.

⁹ See Haffter (1970); cf. also Flach (1998) 73.

¹⁰ Cf. Günther (1999) 148; also Kerkhecker (1988).

¹¹ Cf. Günther (1997b) 64ff.

¹² On the concept of elegiac love cf. Günther (2002) 34ff. (1997b) 46 n. 121; Fedeli (1986); also Griffin (1985) ixff., Fantham in this volume.

Not only in the final elegy, but almost in all poems of the book, both the aetiological and the erotic ones, amatory and Roman themes are fused. 1a announces that aetiological poetry is the medium by which the poet integrates national panegyric with his Callimacheanism: as Callimachus had become the patron of his 'personal' love poetry,¹³ aetiology permits Propertius to integrate national poetry into his program without altering his artistic ideals. Callimachus can in fact—even with much better right—serve as a patron not only of aetiological poetry, but of panegyric poetry as well: in the third and fourth book of the *Aitia* he put the aetiological subject matter into the frame of his praise of queen Berenike.¹⁴ And if Callimachus had spoken of love in his aetiological stories anyhow, he also did so in his praise of the woman and loving wife Berenike.¹⁵

The symbiosis of aetiological and erotic elegy in Propertius' fourth book is reflected both in the integration of erotic elements into the aetiological poems and by the introduction of 'Roman' motifs into the amatory elegies. Thus the fourth elegy on the grave of Tarpeia, in particular, mirrors, in the love story told, the 'tragic' passion of Propertius' love poetry. But erotic motifs can also be detected in 4.2¹⁶ and 4.9, the latter of which also deals, in some way, with the relationship between the sexes (see below p. 388). In the central and most overtly panegyric poem of the collection, 4.6, Propertius conciliates the attitude of the elegiac poet, with his predilection for hedonistic retreat into privacy, with that of the national bard, presenting himself at the end as participating in a banquet where he joins in a celebration of the benefits of the *pax Augusta*, very much in the manner of Horace in the fourth book of the *Odes* (see below p. 377f.). In turn, one of the poems on Cynthia, 4.8, dwells in its introduction on the antiquarian detail of religious cult. 4.3 and 4.11 praise the values of conjugal love, very much a topic of national Roman poetry, if one only thinks of the concluding poem of Horace's *Roman Odes* (C. 3.6, see below p. 395); and in the first poem on Cynthia, 4.7—as already in 4.4—the security of conjugal love is interpreted as the fulfilment of the

¹³ See Günther (1998) 15ff.

¹⁴ See Hollis p. 115f. in this volume.

¹⁵ See Binder-Hamm (1998), especially 31f.

¹⁶ Newman (1997) 275f. has rightly drawn attention to the sexual ambivalence of Vertumnus; thus the statue of the god speaking may even remind one of the Priapus in Tibullus 1.4, a poem alluded to in 4.5.

frustrated aspirations of the *grande passion* of Propertius' earlier poetry. 4.7 is a kind of counterpart to the tragic love, described as a crime in 4.4, and to the moral debasement of the elegiac *domina*, sarcastically depicted in 4.5.¹⁷

From the very start, i.e. in the program elegy 1a, Propertius has put the antiquarian subject matter of his aetiological poetry at the service of a celebration of Rome's present greatness, a greatness springing from the simplicity of Rome's humble past as a result of her destiny. This pattern of thought is developed with reference to the eighth book of Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Messalla elegy of Tibullus (2.5; itself under the influence of Virgil),¹⁸ and allusions to both works pervade the programmatic poems of the book (4.1a and 4.6).¹⁹ In the two concluding elegies (4.10 and 11) the poet praises cardinal Roman virtues in war (4.10) and peace (4.11), and he ends his book with a poem in which he transforms the most ardent emotional aspiration of his previous poetry into a celebration of Roman *mores* (4.11.101f.), putting this celebration into the mouth of a Roman *matrona*. Here we find another characteristic feature of Book 4: love is portrayed in monologues and speeches of women. It is remarkable that the poetic 'I'—in Propertius' previous poetry so obsessed with the vehemence of his own emotions and desires, that the portrayal of women was hardly more than a projection of male fantasies and desires—should now react with such remarkable sensitivity to the female psyche²⁰ as we can detect in the vivid examples of female *ethopoia*²¹ in Book 4.

¹⁷ Cf. Günther (2002) 43f.

¹⁸ Cf. Buchheit (1971); Horsfall (1995) 164ff.

¹⁹ Cf. also the allusions in 4.3 and 4.4 to *Aen.* 4; in 4.7 and 11 to *Aen.* 6 and in 4.9 and 10 again to *Aen.* 8; cf. Becker (1971) *passim*; Solmsen (1961) 281ff.; Pillinger (1969) 195; Fantham (1997) 123 n. 4.

²⁰ In this poems he realizes that 'there are women in his solipsistic universe', as Newman (1997) 485 put it; cf. also Becker (1971) 461 and Weeber (1977) 265.

²¹ In fact *prosopopoia* (cf. Quint. 9.2.29ff.), in the most general sense of the term, or better mimetic monologue, is perhaps the most prominent stylistic device employed throughout the book (from the introductory poems onward); cf. the abundant documentation on *prosopopoia* (*conformatio*), *ethopoia* (*notatio*), *eidolopoia* and *dialogoi* (*sermocinatio*) in Calboli (420ff., 427ff.). One may also speak of *sermocinatio* (*dialogoi*; for 4.5, in particular) or, what later is called *adlocutio* (Calboli 425f.), if one looks for the most general rhetorical term for the technique in question.

*First elegy A = 1a (1–66)*²²

It is fairly certain—though it cannot be regarded as a common view—that what in the mss. is transmitted as a single poem has to be divided into two elegies, though doubts may remain about the point where the poems have to be divided. In what follows I accept Jachmann's division after 66 (65f. are probably interpolated),²³ and I hope that the reasons for this will become apparent in the following interpretation of the poems. Contrary to editions, I use 1a for 1.1–66, 1b for 1.67–150. 1a and b form a pair of introductory poems that announces the two major thematic complexes of the book: 1a the aetiological, 1b the erotic one.

In the first line the poet pretends to act as a guide to a foreigner, addressed as *hospes*, showing him the site of the city of Rome. When in l. 2 the Phrygian Aeneas is mentioned and l. 4 speaks of the *profuga* 'exiled' Euander (in l. 8 Tiber, the *Tuscus amnis*, the 'Tuscan stream', is called *advena* 'alien') it becomes clear that *hospes*²⁴ is chosen in analogy to the eighth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*, where Euander shows his guest Aeneas the site of future Rome.²⁵ In what follows, another model shines through—Tibullus' Messalla elegy 2.5, which in turn refers to Virgil: ll. 22–64 closely correspond to ll. 1–54 of our elegy.²⁶

Propertius' poem falls into three parts: 1–38, 39–54 and 55–66. After the initial address (3–14), the poet describes to his guest the hills of Rome, as they would have looked in former times, contrasting the rural simplicity of their ancient state—similarly described in Tib. 2.5.23ff. (Tib. 2.5.25f. are echoed in ll. 3ff., 2.5.23f. in ll. 9f. with 49f., 2.5.27f. (with 87ff.) in ll. 4 and 19, 2.5.29f. in l. 24)—with the architectural splendor of their modern appearance.²⁷ The view goes

²² Besides Becker (1971) the most important relatively recent contribution on 1a and b is Macleod (1983) 202ff.

²³ Cf. Jachmann (1951) 186f. (418f.); Günther (1997a) 130f. What Camps (p. 46) says about the connection between 1a and 1b implicitly shows that 1.67ff. belong together with 1b.

²⁴ See Macleod (1983) 141f. (who also refers to Cat. 4.1); for a Callimachean model, see Hollis p. 117 in this volume.

²⁵ See Weeber (1977) 15ff.; Binder (1971) 112ff.

²⁶ Cf. Buchheit (1965), La Penna (1977) 176ff.; Fantham (1997) 122f. with further references.

²⁷ The Virgilian contrast of *urbs parva*—*urbs magna*, see Buchheit (1971) 185.

from the Palatine with the temple of Apollo (3f.),²⁸ where, one may suppose, the poet and his host are standing, over the Tarpeian rock (with the Tiber 7f. and a passing allusion to the temple of *Iuppiter tonans*; *bubus* in l. 8 alludes to the *forum Bovarium*, lying between the Tiber and the Palatine) and the Quirinal (i.e., the *aedes Quirini*, 9f.)²⁹ to the Capitoline hill with the *Curia Iulia* (11ff.).³⁰ When the poet comes to the theatre performances of older times (15f.), he hints at the theatre of Marcellus,³¹ another building in course of restoration by the will of the *princeps* (cf. *res gest.* 19 and 35) at the time the poem was composed. This leads to a description of several ancient Roman festival customs and religious rites (17–26): the *Parilia* (19f.), *Vestalia* (21f.), *Compitalia* (23f.),³² and the *Lupercalia* (25f., together with 37f. and 55f., alluding to yet another building, the *Lupercal*). A link couplet, about primitive armor and weapons (27f.), leads to a section on ancient Roman kings, the three original Roman tribes: *Tities*, *Ramnes*, and Solonian *Luceres* (cf. *D.H.* 2.27) and Latin towns near Rome, later extinct or reduced to mere hamlets, tribes and places (29–36).³³

Propertius thus already introduces what he announces later in 4.1.69 (in 1b, according to the division adopted here; cf. also Hollis pp. 115, 119, 123 in this volume) as the three major themes of his poetry: *sacra* ‘religious rites’ (19–26), *dies*³⁴ ‘festivals’ (theatre 15–18) and *cognomina prisca locorum* ‘old names of places’ (3–14; 33–36), an homage to Augustus’ ‘Bautätigkeit’,³⁵ his revival of ancient festivals and rites,³⁶ and perhaps his fondness of the comic theatre (cf. Suet.

²⁸ *Procuere* may well be right (cf. Günther (1994) 266ff.), but for *concuere* cf. *concuere* in 4.8.36 (below p. 384 n. 152).

²⁹ Goold rightly prints *qua* and Watt’s punctuation after *Remi*.

³⁰ Pace Watts (1992) 237 *saepe* is probably to be taken as abl. of *saepe*.

³¹ See Dieterich (1900) 195.

³² The cult of the *Lares Compitales* has been particularly encouraged by Augustus, and his *genius* was worshipped together with them (cf. Ov. *F.* 5.145; Hor. *C.* 4.5.34).

³³ Goold rightly adopts Lucian Mueller’s exchange of 34 with 36 with Ritschl’s *tunc* in 36.

³⁴ *Diesque* is correct in 1.1.69 against Sullivan’s *deosque* favored by Goold. One may object that Propertius in the aetiological poems does not tell the aitia of festivals (he tells that of rites (4.9), places (4.4; 6; 10) and of gods (4.2)), but he speaks of festivals in passing in 4.4 (and in a way also at the end of 4.6, a poem composed on the occasion of the *ludi quinquennales*). *Dies* is an oblique reference to the topic of the following poems, very much in accord with Propertius’ way of referring to his own poetry (see Günther 1997b, 44ff.).

³⁵ Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 28.3–29.4; Zanker (1987); Kienast (1992) 336ff.

³⁶ For *Compitalia* and *Lupercalia* cf. Suet. *Aug.* 93; Kienast (1992) 185ff. There is a contemptuous reference to foreign cults in l. 17, cf. also Scholz (1969).

Aug. 89.1); he even hints at the single aetiological poems that follow:³⁷ 4 (the Tarpeian rock, Tatius and Romulus, Vesta, the *Parilia*), 6 (and 9) (the temple of Apollo on the Palatine), 10 (the temple of *Iuppiter tonans*, mentioned beside that of *Iuppiter Feretrius* in *res gest.* 19 and 35; Romulus), and more obliquely also to 4.2 (primitive images of gods, Tatius, rural festivals) and 4.9 (4.1.6 allude to the same etymology of the Palatine (from *balare*) as 4.9.3;³⁸ the *forum bovarium* 4.1.8). The contrast ‘now—then’, with its emphasis on the rural aspects of the ancient aspect of Rome, introduces the ‘bucolic’, almost Virgilian or Tibullian flavor of the following *ekphraseis topou*.

In referring to the she-wolf, who nurtured Rome’s ancestor Romulus, the following couplet (37f.) stresses again the humble origins of Rome’s present glory. It thus concludes the antiquarian section and aptly leads to a celebration of Rome’s destiny: the resting place of the descendants of the destroyed city of Troy (39–54).³⁹ Right in the middle of this section (45f.), two of the great Roman heroes of the past, Decius and Brutus (also mentioned together Verg. *Aen.* 6.819–824) appear side by side with Augustus, and—again in analogy with Tib. 2.5—the section ends with a quotation of a prophecy of the Sibyl (49f., imitating the cryptic style of such prophecies) and one by Cassandra (51–54) announcing the resurrection of Troy by the will of Jove (again in prophetic style with the apostrophe *Danai*).⁴⁰ This style is already used in the allusive lines on Caesar Augustus 46–48;⁴¹ Venus, by conveying the arms of the Trojan warriors (almost as she presents Aeneas with his divine armour in the *Aeneid*)⁴²—arms destined for victory—brings the arms of her descendant Caesar to Italy. Line 48 refers explicitly to Aeneas’ son Ascanius, called Iulus as the ancestor of the Julian family. Thus Propertius indicates that in l. 46 the reference is to Caesar Augustus as the adopted son of Iulius Caesar,

³⁷ See Fantham (1997), who shows that in the successive elegies 2–10 Propertius takes us ‘systematically’ through the sites of Rome. Cf. also La Penna (1977) 188.

³⁸ See Günther (1998) 252).

³⁹ Again Goold rightly accepts Housman’s transposition of 47f. after 41 with Schrader’s in 42, but for Mueller’s transposition of 87f. after 54 and Murgia’s text cf. Günther (1997a) 129f.

⁴⁰ In accord with the famous passage in Lycophron (perhaps spurious, see West 1984) Cassandra refers to the future woes of Greek conquerors (cf. Lyc. 1281f., see Hollis p. 124 in this volume).

⁴¹ The interpretation given in what follows justifies the transmitted order against Housman’s transposition of 47f. after 40 (adopted by Goold).

⁴² See Fantham (1997) 123 n. 4.

who is thus implicitly represented as the culmination of Roman history from the expatriation of Troy onward by referring to what has rightly been called the Augustan 'National- und Hauslegende'.⁴³ The topic of Propertius' aetiological poetry is the celebration of Rome's destiny, its present greatness under Augustus as a result of ancient virtues. The antiquarian perspective is used as a tool for a celebration of the present, very much in accord with Augustan ideology.

55f. return to Rome's humble origins from the she-wolf and mark 39–54 as a parenthesis. Now the poet openly announces the greatness of the Roman city as the topic of his poetry: the poet will 'lay out' *disponere*⁴⁴ the *moenia* ('the walls') *pio versu* ('with duteous, loyal verse')⁴⁵ despite his limited powers, thus using for his poetry the foremost epithet, which the dutiful son of Caesar Augustus claimed for himself (57f.; cf. Weeber 1977, 31). In his failed attempt at national poetry in 2.10, he tried to make up for his limited powers with *audacia* 'daring' (2.10.5f.); now the day for which the poet hoped has come (2.10.19f.), now the poet is able to put these powers, however small, at the service—no longer of love, but of his national task (59), now he may realize the project still put off into the future in 3.9.47ff.,⁴⁶ where he promised to sing (*ordiar*) of the walls (*moenia*) established by the death of Remus, the Roman steers grazing on the Palatine, the she-wolf rearing the royal pair (3.9.49–51, cf. 4.1.3f., 50, 38). As national bard Propertius compares himself to Ennius, as he already did in his failed attempt in 3.3 (ll. 5ff.); but now, his *ingenium* has risen to Maecenas' command (3.9.52). He compares his poetry to that of the 'national poet' Ennius:⁴⁷ crowned with the ivy of Bacchus (61f.; cf. also 4.6.76), he will even supersede the older poet, who dreamed to be the reincarnation of Homer, by becoming the new Roman Callimachus (65f. are probably interpolated). In ll. 57ff. Propertius inverts the Augustan *recusatio* into an 'anti-*recusatio*' even more explicitly than Virgil in the prooemium to the third *Georgic* or Horace in *C.* 4.2:⁴⁸ he does so by putting himself into a direct line

⁴³ See Dieterich (1900) 203.

⁴⁴ See cf. Jocelyn (1986) 110.

⁴⁵ See cf. Fantham (1997) 124.

⁴⁶ See Günther (1997a) 74 n. 39; on 3.9 as a program poem cf. Bennett (1968), Butrica (1996) 142ff., Fantham (2000) 196ff., also Syndikus (1998) 387f.

⁴⁷ On Propertius' attitude towards Ennius cf. Jocelyn (1986), on this passage 108ff.; cf. also Newman (1997) 90.

⁴⁸ Cf. Günther (1999).

with Callimachus as a poet who composed panegyric poetry in an aetiological frame. Now Propertius' quest for Callimachus, first uttered in 3.1,⁴⁹ fulfils itself, and thus the poet oversteps the boundaries that still separated national and personal poetry in 3.1–3 and 3.9.

First elegy B = 1b (67–150)

Already in 1a the poet had moved from the role as guide to a proud proclamation of his talent and aspiration as a national bard; now (1.67–70) the *vates* in priestly attitude (echoing Hor. *C.* 3.1.1f. and, again, Tib. 2.5.1 (*Roma, fave—Phoebe, fave*) in particular; Tib. 2.5.12 is echoed in 4.1.68) addresses Rome and its citizens in order to ask for good omens for this precarious task and to define more precisely the themes of his poetry (see above p. 359), but he is soon briskly interrupted (71–74)⁵⁰—though, not as one would expect, by Apollo or the Muse, but by a person who, in what follows, reveals himself as a Babylonian astrologer named Horos (77f.),⁵¹ who warns the poet that Apollo is unfavourable to his undertaking;⁵² if in 1.57–60 Propertius

⁴⁹ In 4.1.63f. Propertius explicitly claims for himself the title conferred to him ironically, but surely as a compliment in Hor. *Epp.* 2, 91ff., where Horace refers to Prop. 3.1, in order to describe self-ironically his own claim of following Alcaeus. Regarding the supposed hostility of Horace toward Propertius and the chronological relationship between Prop. 4.1 and the *Florus epistle* cf. already Becker (1971) 454 n. 1 and more recently Syndikus (1998) 377f. There is a further allusion to *Epp.* 2.2.91 in 4.1.135.

⁵⁰ In l. 71 Goidl prints Livineius' ingenious *fuge* with *discere* from the *deteriores*, but the transmitted *quo ruis imprudens, vage, dicere fata* is defensible (rightly explained, e.g., in Butler-Barber, Camps; see also Richardson *ad loc.*), and *vage* 'straying from your true course' may allude to an etymology of Horos from *hóros* 'limit' (cf. next note). *Fata* is very apt after the poet's prayer for a good omen (cf. Tib. 2.5.12); it may also refer pseudo-etymologically to *fave* in 67.

⁵¹ That he cannot be identified with the *hospes* of l. 1 (thus, e.g., Richardson 1976, p. 414) is shown by the intervening address to the *cives*. The change of address alone need not make it impossible to regard 1 as a single poem (see Abel 1930, 104), but, whether we start a new poem or not, with l. 67 the situation has changed fundamentally, and l. 71 cannot refer back to l. 1. The name of the astrologer, Horos, who claims, beside his Babylonian ancestor, also descent from Conon, a leading astronomer of Alexandria, alludes of course to the synonymous Egyptian god, but it has also etymological associations with *hora* 'hour' (Horos has been related to *hora* already in antiquity cf. Maltby (1991) s.v. *hora*) and gr. *hóros* 'limit'.

⁵² Sandbach's *aersus cantat Apollo* (accepted by Gould) for the transmitted *cantas a- A-* is palmary. *Cantare* with a different subject in 68, 69, 73 is intentional (*cantet avis—cantat Apollo* in 68–73 at the end of line!). The word repetition is a further indication that 67–73 belong together.

explicitly sabotaged the traditional *recusatio* in a kind of anti-*recusatio*, here he sabotages it implicitly by a kind of mock *recusatio*.

Horos' speech is the first example of mimetic monologue, in which the pretentious prophet, assuming—as the poet did in ll. 67–70—a solemn quasi-priestly attitude, is depicted with poignant irony: after presenting himself and his business (75f. and 83f.,⁵³ 77–81), the astrologer asserts his credibility (89–118). He first adduces several examples of prophecies of his own that have come true (89–102). He contrasts the prophecies of Calchas (who obviously did not heed the stars) in Aulis with their catastrophic consequences (109–18).

After this confirmation of his authority Horos returns to his actual aim⁵⁴ and proper topic: the poet's horoscope (119–46). The mention of Propertius' Umbrian descent (121f.), already briefly appearing in 1a, is extended to an *ekphrasis* of the Mevanian lake (123f.) and Propertius' native town Assisi (125f.). This leads to a passage dwelling on further autobiographical detail, following a scheme that we find elsewhere in programmatic contexts in Augustan poets (cf. V. *Georg.* 4.559ff.; Hor. *C.* 3.30 and later Ov. *Am.* 3.15, *Tr.* 4.10): Horos briefly records the story of Propertius' childhood and youth (cf. the *sphragis* of the first book, 1.22), when the poet lost his father (127f.) and his possessions in the confiscations of the civil war (129f.). But Apollo soon inspired poetic talent in the youth, which made him abandon a career in politics in favor of poetry (131–34).⁵⁵ However, he asserts, his talent suits love elegy and nothing else (135f.).⁵⁶ What follows is a description of the poet in the role of the elegiac lover: the poet who in 4.1.57f. had abandoned the *servitium amoris* in favor of a *servitium patriae* returns to the *militia amoris* (137f.), under the complete control of his *domina* (139–46; Housman's transposition of 143f. after

⁵³ There can be no doubt that Richmond's transposition of 83f. to this place (and 85f. after 102) is correct. 87f. is spurious (see above p. 360 n. 39). Becker (1966) would excise 81–88 *in toto*.

⁵⁴ *Lacrimis* l. 20 take up *lacrimas* in 73, and thus marks 75–118 as a kind of excursus.

⁵⁵ On the motif of 'Lebenswahl' cf. Steidle (1962), Wenzel (1969); cf. also Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) pp. 1ff. L. 134 (*tonare!*) is reminiscent of Call. *A.* 1, fr. 1, 20. On Prop. 4.1.127–34 cf. also Jocelyn (1986) 105.

⁵⁶ One has looked in vain for a plausible explanation of the transmitted *fallax*; we surely need a positive epithet for *opus*; Goold is right to print Heinsius' *pellax* (see Butler-Barber 1933, *ad loc.*).

140 is perhaps correct). The speech ends with an enigmatic warning of the astrologer from the sign of the Crab in precarious situations (147–50).⁵⁷

In view of the distinctly humorous tone of 1b, it is surely impossible to understand the poem as taking back the commitment of 1a to national poetry. Yet, the irony does not sabotage every possibility for the poet of writing more love poetry either. The depiction of the poet under the *servitium amoris* announces—as it does in the opening poem of the first book—that the book will indeed contain love poetry: the poet is still somehow under the spell of his mistress. Yet, by referring ironically to the program of the poet's previous love poetry, 1b announces a new kind of love poetry: love poetry that refers back ironically to the poet's earlier work. If the poet depicts himself, via the ludicrous figure of Horos, under the whims of his *domina*, this bears witness to a new attitude toward love: the distanced self-conscious—Horatian—attitude announced in his farewell poem at the end of the third book (3.24/25). With its ironic tone 1b announces an emotionally more detached love poetry that subtly inverts, and indeed reinterprets the poet's earlier work, just as 1b ironically sabotages the established scheme of elegiac *recusatio* (Conte 1992, 118f. speaks of a *haesitatio*). Thus 1b is complementary to 1a, and it would indeed be hard to understand 1b in isolation. 1a and 1b together announce the new poetic program of Propertius, and this program is exactly the mixture of aetiological and erotic poems we find in the fourth book as we read it.

⁵⁷ The train of thought will induce one to understand the sinister connotations of the crab in respect to the girl, who is fated to manipulate the poet at her will. Thus I am confident that the interpretation of Cramer (1954) 88, Sandbach (1962) 265 n. 2 is correct: after 137ff. the crab can hardly refer back to the poet's *astra* (thus the explanation of Boll advocated by Dieterich (1900) 218ff. and other more recent attempts to refer the Crab to the poet's course of life are misguided (regarding Keyser (1992), see also Butrica (1993); regarding *terga* cf. Shackleton Bailey 1956, 226). 147f. refer metaphorically to shipwreck in love: at the end of this speech on love poetry this image combines the metaphoric connotations water in love poetry (see Murgatroyd (1995) and Günther (1997b, 39f.) with Callimachean water symbolism (for a similar use of water metaphoric for the course of the (love!) poet in the context of *recusatio* cf. 3.3.21ff.). Of course, the prophet employs a cryptic language (as are ll. 46–50 in 1 A), but this does not mean that he is depicted as talking mere nonsense in order to discredit him (thus Butler-Barber (1933) *ad loc.* with reference to Housman; against this rightly Cramer and Sandbach *loc. cit.*; for still another interpretation cf. Macleod 1983, 211).

*Second elegy*⁵⁸

The first aetiological poem⁵⁹ treats its topic in a manner particularly close to Hellenistic models.⁶⁰ As yet another example of *sermocinatio* (see above p. 357), the explanation of the name of the god Vertumnus (probably a god of the changing seasons; the name is derived from a participle passive in—*menos* from *vertere* ‘to change’) is placed in the mouth of a statue of the god, located at the spot where the *vicus Tuscus* ran into the *forum*.⁶¹ The statue announces to an imaginary passerby that the god himself (1f.)⁶² will give various alternative explanations of his name,⁶³ a speech that leaves space for mentioning *en passant* some antiquarian detail about places, tribes (3ff., 49f.), Roman history (51f.), and ritual connected with the god (11ff., 21ff.). First

⁵⁸ There is a useful recent commentary on the poem by Boldrer (1999).

⁵⁹ In Günther (1997a) 42 I accepted Goold’s text with the two large transpositions of 13–18 after 42 (Heyworth) and 51–54, 49f., 55f. (after 4 Housman) without comment; in the meantime a member of my graduate class on Propertius, Mr. Christian Orth, has persuaded me that the first transposition is wrong; the second one I would still regard with much sympathy, and I still regard 35f. as interpolated (see Günther 1997a, 124).

⁶⁰ See Hollis p. 119 in this vol.; Pinotti (1983); cf. also Mader (1991).

⁶¹ It may not be by chance, that the proud native of Assisi (1.125f.), located at the border between Umbria and Etruria, as the poet notes himself at the end of the first book (1.21.9f.), opens the cycle of aetiological elegies with an homage to a god, who proudly announces to be *Tuscus* and of Tuscan origin (3) and whom Varro (*L. L.* 5.46) calls *deus Etruriae princeps*; see Newman (1997) 54ff., 275f.; cf. also Latte (1971) 191f. and Pinotti (1983) 79. Etruria is already hinted at in 4.1.3 and 8 (Euander and the *advena Tiberis*). As Etruria figures prominently in the concluding epigrams of the first book (21 and 22, of course, via the Perusine war), it returns in the lament of Veji at the emotional peak in the central section of last aetiological elegy of the fourth book. Could this also be an homage to the *equus Etrusco de sanguine regum* (3.9.1) Maecenas (cf. also Hor. *C.* 3.29.1)?

⁶² Shackleton Bailey’s *fatente deo* for the transmitted *paterna dei* aptly stresses the fact that the *aition* is told by the god himself.

⁶³ For alternative explanations in aetiological poetry, cf. Loehr (1996). Vertumnus, ‘the changeable’, whose changeable, elusive appearance causes surprise to the passerby (l. 1), he himself points to various possibilities of explaining his name; Newman (1997) rightly stresses that Vertumnus’ words ‘make a serious point’: ‘Language is only unambiguous when it has little meaning. As soon as its meaning is loaded, it becomes possible to unload it by different chutes. Religious (vatic) and artistic language is supremely loaded, because it is trying to communicate a reality, which is incommensurable with the rational. Cheerfully noting different etymologies of his name, Vertumnus calls attention to the inadequacies of normal vocabulary and appreciation. The real explanation will be given only by the god (19–20, and it is one of metamorphosis’; there could be no better comment on the numerous (pseudo-)etymological word plays in Propertius.

it is suggested that the god may have been called *Vertamnus* (9f.)⁶⁴ from *verso amne* 'the diverted stream', since where he stands the river Tiber changed its path—an explanation repeated by Ovid *Fast.* 6.409⁶⁵ or *Vertannus* (11f.), since to him are offered the fruits of the changing seasons (*vertentis anni* 'the changing year'). But then he opts for a different explanation (19ff.) and derives his name simply from *vertere* (47f.), since the god may be dressed variously and accordingly changes his appearance. In the end the speaker refers to an inscription of six lines on the pedestal of the statue: the quotation is introduced as if it were the end of an inscription, thus suggesting obliquely that the whole speech is an inscription, though it is much too long for that (for the epigrammatic models of the poem cf. Schulz-Vanheyden 1969, 78ff.). It attributes the statue to the legendary worker in bronze from the reign of Numa Mamurius (Veturius) (Ov. *F.* 3, 259ff.; Plut. *Num.* 131; Fest. 117 L.). In making the point that a once crude statue in maple wood has given way to a distinguished work in bronze, the text at the same time alludes to a Callimachean model (cf. Hollis p. 119 in this volume) and brings home in a slightly different manner the contrast 'past simplicity versus contemporary refinement' of 1a, where the poet spoke of the *aurea templa*, 'the golden temples', of his day versus the *fictiles dei* 'the gods of clay' of the past (4.1.5).

*Third elegy*⁶⁶

The Vertumnus elegy is followed by a love poem, which gives the first example of female *ethopoiia*: a letter of a newly married girl to her husband away on military service in the east. The couple bears Greek romantic Pseudonyms, Arethusa and Lycotes, and it has been suggested that the pseudonyms may conceal Aelia Galla and Postumus of 3.12. In any case, 4.3 refers back to this poem as a close counterpart.⁶⁷ The separation of lovers, caused either by military or com-

⁶⁴ For *Vertamnus* instead of the transmitted *Vertumnus*; and again *Vertanni* in 12 instead of *Vertumni*, see Goold (1967) 95.

⁶⁵ Cf. J. G. Frazer (London 1929) *ad loc.* with a useful survey on Vertumnus.

⁶⁶ An excellent interpretation of the poem and its Ovidian counterpart is given by Merklin (1968).

⁶⁷ See Becker (1971) 470.

mercial excursions of the man or by the infidelity of the woman going off with a rival, is a standard motif of Roman elegy.⁶⁸ 3.12 adapts it to a married couple, and 4.3 now introduces conjugal love as the most prominent 'sentimental' topic of the fourth book.

Regarding the form of the poem, the love letter of 4.3 looks forward to Ovid's *Heroides*,⁶⁹ but Reinhard⁷⁰ has also made the important observation that formally we find here first of all an adaptation of the monologues of abandoned women of Greek myth (like Cat. 64.132ff.). These monologues had, by reversion of gender, been adapted in Latin elegy to the abandonment of the man by the woman (as for instance in 1.8a). And if in 4.3 this standard situation is again by a reversion brought back to its archetype,⁷¹ 4.3 is the first example of Propertius' self interpretation as an elegiac love poet.

The letter begins playfully with a wordplay on the letter formula (1f.),⁷² and in a first section (1–18)⁷³—given a very lively and emphatic character by *anaphorae* and *epanalepseis*—the girl laments her husband's absence and describes her desolate state at home, where she weaves a cloak for her husband at war (17f.). In what follows, a long account of Arethusa's solitary life at home (29–62) is framed by two exclamatory passages of equal length (19–28 and 63–72). In the first one Arethusa curses the inventors of warfare (19–22) and expresses her hope that her husband will remain faithful (23–28).⁷⁴ This wish is emphatically repeated in the concluding section that ends with a reference to a votive inscription, should Arethusa's prayers be fulfilled and her husband safely return (71f.).⁷⁵

⁶⁸ Cf. Tedeschi (1990).

⁶⁹ On the priority of Propertius, see Zimmermann (2000).

⁷⁰ P. 206 in this volume.

⁷¹ Portraying Arethusa in the situation of a heroine of Greek myth elevates her to a quasi heroic status (similar to Tarpeia in the next elegy, see p. 370ff., or Cynthia at the end of 4.7 see below p. 380ff.); for echoes of Virgil's Dido, see Bernardini Marzolla (1955) 177–79 and Heyworth (1999) 72.

⁷² *Suo . . . Lycotae, cum totiens absis, si potes esse meus* (echoed by *meis—meae* in ll. 4–6); 3ff. is full of puns: *lecturo—oblita—derit—erit—lacrimis—facta—litura—fallet—littera—erunt—viderunt*. L. 4 is imitated by Ov. Her. 3.3f. (the dependence of the latter on Propertius is so evident, that *pace* Lingenberg (2003) 119 it needs not to be argued); cf. also Cairns (2000) 173.

⁷³ There are serious textual difficulties in 7–11, none of which admits for a certain solution. Gould offers a plausible 'Lesetext'; for 11 cf. Watts (1992) 237.

⁷⁴ Cf. Reinhard p. 211 in this volume.

⁷⁵ Heyworth (1999) 80 makes a good case for Burman's *salva* for *grata* in 72.

At the center of the account of Arethusa's life at home stands her wish to join her husband in war (43–48). The account itself is filled with much detail that suits the psychology of a young girl very well: in the long cold winter nights—when she wishes to be with him—she works on the cloak (33f.);⁷⁶ she sleeps with her little dog, lovingly called by its name (55f.).⁷⁷ In her wish to be close to her beloved she learns everything about the far away places of the east and their climate: what a complicated business for the mind of a little girl occupied with nothing but thoughts of her love, and how intelligent the god must be, who arranged the world like this (35–42)!⁷⁸ The wish of the central section is followed by a praise of conjugal love (49–52),⁷⁹ after which (53f., 57–62), fittingly, the wife's religious activities⁸⁰ (already mentioned in 17) are described in a way reminiscent of the atmosphere often evoked by Tibullus.⁸¹

The poem mirrors and inverts in more than one respect amatory *topoi* of love elegy by an inversion of the gender role. Conventionally the elegiac lover may describe his *servitium amoris* as a kind of military service, the only military service he is good at and which prevents him from taking part in real military adventures (1.6; Tib. 1.1.75f.). Now a girl sympathizes with her husband, who is on duty, and actually wishes to go to war with him. Arethusa, who despises material values (51f.), is the precise opposite of the materialistic *domina* of 2.9, who uses every absence of her lover to stay with other men. In her wish to join her husband in military service Arethusa is also the opposite of Cynthia, who goes off with a wealthy rival in 1.8a or 1.16. She is the faithful woman elegiac poets find in their dreams,

⁷⁶ *Chlamydas* Barber for the impossible *gladios*; cf. also Heyworth (1999) 74.

⁷⁷ *Craugidos* is Buecheler's certain emendation for the transmitted *Glaucidos*; the etymology of the Greek word is alluded to by *vox* (for this technique cf. Günther (1994) 256f.). Housman's transposition of the couplet after 34 may not be strictly necessary, but it yields such an improvement, both here and in 53f., that one will be inclined to accept it (as does Gould; see also Merklin (1968) 469; Heyworth (1999) 77 wants to transpose 51–56 after 41 or 30, but 51f. has a point after 49f., see below).

⁷⁸ 37f. have been suspected by Heyworth (1999) 75.

⁷⁹ *Aperto in coniuge* has already point in stressing *coniuge* (cf., e.g., Fedeli (1965) *ad loc*; also Lieberg (1998)) and has further connotations, well interpreted by Merklin (1968) 468. Pace Heyworth (1999) 76 it should not be changed; any other epithet introduces an unwanted extra thought.

⁸⁰ 53f. and 57–60 refer to Arethusa's religious observance; Reitzenstein's (1926) explanation of 53f. is labored.

⁸¹ Cf. Günther (2002) 44ff.

sleeping alone, or even spending sleepless nights weaving in the company of a slave girl or an *anus* (1.3.39ff., 2.29.31ff., Tib. 1.3.83ff.). But Arethusa is no longer a mere projection of fantasy and desire; she is a young girl of flesh and blood, realistically described with subtle insights into female psychology.⁸² With her the poet's dreams have, in a way, become reality, the aspirations of the eternally unfulfilled love of Propertius' earlier poetry have become reality in the feelings of a loving wife.⁸³

The reversion of the gender role in the fourth book entails a description of the standard situations of elegy from the perspective of the woman, and it is revealing with what precision the emotional pattern of 1.8a is inverted in 4.3: although Cynthia has left him, the poet still cares for the hardships she may suffer abroad (1.8.5ff.; with a motif demonstrably borrowed from Gallus.⁸⁴ Similarly, Arethusa cares for the hardships her husband will suffer on duty (23f.) and weaves a cloak for him. Yet, Arethusa is not the altruistic lover, totally dedicated to the partner however unfaithful he may be, as Propertius pretends to be in 1.8.21ff. (and elsewhere): Arethusa is very much a down-to-earth-woman—and a little girl—who plainly *admits* that she wishes to possess her husband, complains that he takes warfare or anything else more seriously than her, and wants him back only if he remains faithful to her (11f., 25–28, 62–70). She is the possessive woman of love elegy, yet in a quite different guise. Presenting herself—as Cornelia in 4.11—as a model of wifely devotion to her husband,⁸⁵ Arethusa is a woman who longs for the faithful and true companion in whose guise the elegiac poet presents himself, although this is not appreciated by his capricious *domina*. Thus Arethusa is not as condoning toward possible sexual adventures of her husband as a prudent wife is supposed to be, and for once breaks the canon of wifely virtues she so admirably displays otherwise—but perhaps for the latter insight she is still too young.

⁸² Hutchinson (1984) 101 with n. 23 has rightly stressed the realistic, 'Roman' character of the poem comparing the letters of Cicero to his wife.

⁸³ For Propertius' reappraisal of conjugal love in respect to his earlier poetry, cf. La Penna (1977) 167ff.; cf. also Griffin (1985) 112ff., 141.

⁸⁴ Cf. Griffin (1985) 44f.; Cairns p. 84 in this volume.

⁸⁵ See Treggiani (1991) 229ff.

Fourth elegy

As already in 4.2, so in this second aetiological poem the topic is again announced in a preamble (1f.). This time the poet himself speaks in the first person (as also later in 4.10): he will speak (*fabor*)⁸⁶ of Tarpeia's crime and grave.⁸⁷ Purporting to explain the *priscum cognomen* of the Capitoline hill, *mons Tarpeium*, or of the particular eminence that was known as the *saxum Tarpeium*, the poet tells the story of the Vestal Tarpeia betraying the Roman garrison there (according to other sources commanded by her father Spurius Tarpeius) to the Sabine king Titus Tatius who waged war on Romulus in revenge for the abduction of the Sabine women.

The poem shows a very neat symmetrical structure. A central speech by Tarpeia (31–66; = 36 ll.) is framed by two narrative sections of 26 ll. each: 3–16, 19–30 (subdivided 8 + 6 + 6 + 8)⁸⁸ and 67–92 (subdivided 6 + 8 + 8 + 6); the opening couplet, stating the topic (1f.), corresponds to a concluding one, summing up the content of the *aition*, alluding again to the criminal nature of the act that lies at its origin (93f.).⁸⁹ The scene for the story is set by the *ekphrasis* of the grove (cf. Liv. 1.21.3) opposite to Tatius' camp (3–8; with *contra* (Camps) for *fontem* in 7), these six lines are followed by again six lines (9–14), which, in accord with the 'program' of 1a, compare the site at the time of the story with contemporary Rome. After this excursus the place is further identified as that where Tarpeia

⁸⁶ Cf. Tränkle (1960) 44.

⁸⁷ For Kraffert's *scelus* for the transmitted *nemus*, see Camps *ad loc.* *scelus* very aptly describes the topic of the poem, and *nemus* may not only have crept in because of *lucus* in 3, one may also have thought of the *Tarpeios lucos* in 4.8.31, which cannot, however, be identical with the *lucus* of 4.4.3ff. (see Butler-Barber (1933) *ad* 4.8.31). There is a pun in *Tarpeia*—*turpe*, and the assonance *scelus*—*sepulcrum* confirms Kraffert's restoration.

⁸⁸ Much disturbance of the sequence of verses at the beginning of the poem has been suspected (see Heyworth 1999, 80ff. with reference to other treatments). I think now that 17f. (transposed after 86 by Housman, or after 92 by Broekhuysen; cf. also Heyworth 1999, 84) are an example for the dislocation of an interpolated couplet; see Günther (1997a) 115ff.; cf. also Tarrant p. 64 in this volume; except this I think only Shippers' transposition of 13f. after 10 has some advantage, but I see no need to exchange 3–8 with 9–14 with Shackleton Bailey and Goold.

⁸⁹ Goold and Heyworth (1999) 85f. (who correctly explains 94) rightly accept Weidgen's *turpe Iovis* for *tarpeio* and Lütjohann's *iniuste . . . mortis* for *iniustae . . . sortis*. Weidgen's emendation is among the best, in my opinion, ever made in Propertius. *Turpe* alludes to the *cognomen* 'Tarpeium' via the word play of l.l.

on her way to draw water from a spring saw Tatius and fell in love with him (15f., 19–22). Thus she returns there often under a pretext and, when evening falls,⁹⁰ sits north of the hill and laments her love (23–30).

In her speech she wishes to be captured by Tatius (31–38) and, knowing that she commits a crime, compares herself to female sinners of Greek myth like Scylla and Ariadne (39–46). She confesses that she would like to help Tatius, whose beauty she prefers to the shaggy Romulus, and intends to use an imminent festival to betray the citadel (47–54).⁹¹ In return she desires to be married to Tatius and thus to atone for the abducted Sabine women (55–62). Finally she asks for sleep and for dreams about her beloved (63–66). In her sleep Venus adds to her fury (67–72),⁹² and when finally the festival of the Parilia (cf. 1a) comes (73–80),⁹³ Tarpeia uses the leisure to lead Tatius into the citadel (81–88).⁹⁴ But Tatius, instead of honouring her crime by marrying her, has her crushed by his men between their shields (89–92).

The narrative displays all the prominent features of lyrical narrative: descriptive detail, *prosphonesis* and, at its center, a long mimetic monologue, and if Propertius gives love as the cause for Tarpeia's crime, while it is money in other sources for the story (Liv. 1.11; Plut. *Rom.* 17; Dion. Hal. 2.38ff.; Varro, *L.L.* 5.41), this is a prime example of the integration of aetiological and love poetry by what Heinze so aptly described as 'elegische Erotisierung der Erzählung'.⁹⁵ The poet adapts a story of Roman history to the 'standard' love stories of Greek myth like that of Achilleus and Pisidike,⁹⁶ Pherelaos and Kometo or Scylla and Minos (referred to in 1.39).⁹⁷ In doing so, the poet again interprets a central trait of his own erotic poetry: elegiac love runs, like that of Tarpeia, contrary to the established values

⁹⁰ See Heyworth (1999) 81.

⁹¹ On the text cf. Watts (1992) 237f.; Tarrant p. 54 in this volume.

⁹² Cf. Warden (1978).

⁹³ Butrica (2000) deletes 74f., not implausibly, but glossing of this kind is good practice of Propertius himself (see Günther 1994 and 1998). Butrica is right about *lautitiis* and *pedes* in 76 and 78; in 73 Richmond's *urvi* is likely, see Goold (1992) 312f.

⁹⁴ Goold is right in accepting Barber's transposition of 83f. after 86 with Jacob's text (*pace* Heyworth 1999, 83), as regards 85, see Heyworth *loc. cit.*

⁹⁵ Cf. Heinze (1919) 78ff.

⁹⁶ Cf. Lightfoot (1999) on Parth. XXI.

⁹⁷ *A cause célèbre* in Augustan literature, as Hubbard (1975) 119 put it.

of Roman society, it is a grand unfulfilled passion, which sets apart the person exclusively dominated by it: this love is essentially tragic and ultimately leads to death. 4.4 already contains the central motifs that run through the erotic poems of the book: love and death, funeral and grave in particular, but also marriage, the legal, acceptable union as the unfulfilled goal of Tarpeia's tragic, i.e., elegiac love.

As in 4.3—to which it forms an antithetic contrast⁹⁸—Propertius here interprets his love poetry by a reversion of the gender role, and at the same time he refers back to the literary archetypes of the description of elegiac love, which had been women rather than men. And if the speech of the lonely Tarpeia on her rock distinctly recalls the famous speeches of the desperate Medea seeking consolation by lamenting her grief to nature in Euripides and Apollonios Rhodios, then not only the Roman legend is ennobled by its distinguished literary guise; the Roman protagonist of the story of love, Tarpeia—and elegiac love—is raised to the heroic heights of the great sinners for love in Greek tragedy and myth. These stories had always belonged to the stock of Propertius' mythological *exempla* (echoed in the mention of Scylla in 4.4.39), but now Roman legend is infused with the sentiment of elegiac love via its adaptation to the female archetypes of tragic love in Greek myth, and that is something different.

Fifth elegy

The second love poem of the book *stricto sensu* is a genre piece on a well-established figure of ancient literature, the *lena*, the bawd.⁹⁹ The poem brings the erotic motifs of the preceding elegy, 'criminal' love, tomb and death, back into their conventional elegiac context¹⁰⁰ by depicting ironically the elegiac lover and his mistress, and thus prepares for the reappearance of Cynthia in 4.7 and 4.8.

Two introductory distichs, where the poet calls down his curses on the tomb of the *lena* (1–4), and a conclusion that depicts the bawd on her deathbed (65–74), followed again by two distiches of

⁹⁸ Cf. Burck (1966b) 422–23; Hutchinson (1984) 100ff.

⁹⁹ Cf. Meyers (1996).

¹⁰⁰ 'After the Vestal Virgin who betrays her city for love—in contrast to Livy's account where she sells it for gold—we meet the *lena* who advises other women to sell their love for gifts'; Heyworth (1999) 86.

curses on her tomb (77–78),¹⁰¹ frame a central section of forty-eight lines¹⁰² which depict the evil powers of the *lena*. After an introductory passage, where she is portrayed as a witch (5–20),¹⁰³ the *lena* herself delivers a speech to a woman, who at the end is revealed as the poet's sweetheart (63f.),¹⁰⁴ and gives her various advice in matters of love (21–62). As a monologue of a deceased woman the poem echoes the preceding one and, as an example of female *ethopoia*, it is the precise counterpart of 4.3: 4.5, sarcastically, makes explicit the foil for 4.3, the materialism and greed of the elegiac *domina*.

The poem appears to owe much to Tibullus: the curse on a bawd's tomb, her witchcraft and much of the amatory advice are reminiscent of Tib. 1.2.43–54, 5.47–66, 2.3.51–8, 6, 44ff. and 1.4.9–72; almost all the various suggestions in the bawd's speech recall those given in the speech of Priapus in 1.5 (cf. also 2.3.51ff.). 4.5 somehow resembles this poem even in that the addressee of the advice is revealed only in the end (63f.): Tibullus concludes his poem with an *aprosdoketon*, which reveals that the poet did not seek Priapus' advice for himself, but in order to help somebody else, who had consulted him.¹⁰⁵

*Sixth elegy*¹⁰⁶

The second half of the book opens with a second prooemium. 4.6 refers back to the program elegies 4.1a and b, but at the same time the poem celebrates *the* major event of the recent past. Already in 1a the poet had hinted at Augustus' 'Bautätigkeit', but now he places Augustus explicitly at the center of the book in an elegy about the victory at Actium, which once and for all secured Augustus' power: the poem tells the *aition* of Apollo's temple on the Palatine, the most

¹⁰¹ For the epigrammatic models, cf. Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 102 n. 4 with reference to Tränkle (1960) 110f., 177.

¹⁰² There can be no doubt about the deletion of 55f.; Goold is probably right in exchanging 29f. with 45f.

¹⁰³ Ll. 19f. are beyond repair; cf. the most recent treatment by Heyworth (1999) 87ff.

¹⁰⁴ The situation of a lover overhearing advice of another woman to his beloved is found in comedy (Plaut. *Most.* 157ff.; cf. also *Poen.* 210ff.); l. 64 is correctly explained by Heyworth (1999) 91.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Günther (1997b) 56.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Baker (1983), Cairns (1984), Arkin (1989), Mader (1989), Kierdorf (1995).

representative building of the Augustan era.¹⁰⁷ Though the claim that the temple was founded because of Apollo's support at Actium does not reflect exactly the historical truth (the plan for the temple was conceived already several years before Actium; cf. Cass. Dio 49.15.5, Velleius 2.81.3), it conforms to official ideology, as is shown by the institution of the so-called *ludi quinquennales* in honor of this victory, which were first performed in 28 BC, the year of the temple's inauguration (Cass. Dio 53.1.4; cf. also Hor. *C.* 1.31 and Prop. 2.31). The reference to the victory over the Sygambri of 16 BC (l. 77; cf. Cass. Dio 54.19.1 and 8; 20) indicates beyond reasonable doubt that 4.6 has indeed been composed for the occasion of the *ludi quinquennales* held in this year,¹⁰⁸ celebrated by Agrippa, since Augustus was away in Gaul in consequence of Lollius' defeat.

In the preamble (1–10)¹⁰⁹ the poet presents himself as a priest (calling himself *vates*) performing a sacrifice and, as usual in the aetiological poems, he indicates the topic of the poem: the temple of Apollo on the Palatine (11–14). In presenting himself in this way he follows very closely the Callimachean model at the beginning of the hymn to Apollo (he also alludes to the water metaphor¹¹⁰ and integrates the epithets *mollis* and *blandus* alluding to the Callimachean *lepton*),¹¹¹ but he does so via the reference to earlier adaptations by Augustan poets (V. *Georg.* 3.1ff.; Hor. *C.* 3.1.1ff.); in particular he refers, as already in 4.1a, to Tibullus 2.5: the poem of Tibullus presents a priest entering the temple of Apollo at the Palatine in a way, which first makes one suspect that the poet might present himself metaphorically as the Callimachean poet priest. But soon we learn that he is in fact speaking of Messallinus' actual priesthood as a new member of the community of the *decem viri sacris faciundis*.¹¹² In Prop. 4.6 the priest is indeed the poet himself. However, the metaphor is

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Zanker (1987) 76ff., 90ff., *passim*; Zanker (1983); Jucker (1982); Lefèvre (1989).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Kierdorf (1995) 175ff.; Cairns (1984) 149ff. has tentatively suggested that the poem may have been intended for public performance.

¹⁰⁹ For the structure of the poem, cf. Cairns (1984) 133ff.

¹¹⁰ See above p. 364 n. 57; thus preparing for the sea-picture in what follows; for the prominence of water imagery in Propertius see Newman (1997) 140ff.; for the various connotations of water in antiquity cf. also Nisbet-Rudd (2004) pp. 171f.

¹¹¹ Cf. Asper 1997; Reinhard p. 211 in this volume.

¹¹² Cf. Murgatroyd (1994) pp. 163ff.

integrated so closely into the situation of a festival that the text oscillates constantly between the real and metaphorical level of expression.¹¹³

By mentioning Callimachus and Philetas Propertius also refers back to his introductory poem of the third book, 3.1, but, whereas there he—in the conventional way of the elegiac poet of love—still professed to be a poet of love and peace (in contrast to war), in 4.6. he claims to go a new way (10).¹¹⁴ On this new way he will compose national poetry and thus become the successor of Callimachus, as an aetiological poet, as he claimed in 4.1a. Accordingly, in what follows (11–14) he indicates the Palatine temple and, via the god whom Augustus had chosen as his personal protector, the *princeps* himself as the subject of his poetry. He calls on the muse Calliope for help in this undertaking. In 3.2 and 3.3 she had been presented as inspiring love poetry, but conventionally she is associated with heroic themes.¹¹⁵

The central section, referring to the battle of Actium, must be seen before the background of its forerunner in the eighth book of the *Aeneid* (ll. 675ff.).¹¹⁶ Propertius renounces the description of the battle¹¹⁷ and begins, as in 4.4, with an *ekphrasis topou*¹¹⁸ (15–18). Then (19–24) the two opposite forces—that of Augustus and that of Antony

¹¹³ See Kierdorf (1995) 168. This is perfectly natural in the context of Cairns' (1984) 139ff. analysis of the speaker as the conventional choric speaker of ancient poetry. Cairns is also right in detecting in 3ff. echoes of the involvement of the chorus and of the muse (putting 15–68 in her mouth); Propertius surely plays with the choric practice of multiple speakers, and the poem subtly plays upon the possibilities of hearing the voice of the poet throughout or that of the chorus (in 3–14) and of Calliope (in 15ff.); the 'multiple element in the choric—figure that speaks throughout Propertius 4.6' (p. 148) is a very happy expression.

¹¹⁴ Tibullus in 2.5 too presented his priest as a *novus sacerdos*, thus suggesting that a poet may make a claim of novelty (cf. V. *Georg.* 3.10f.).

¹¹⁵ See Cairns (1984) 149 with n. 83. In ll. 13f. Propertius gives a nice twist to the *topos* of holy silence (see Mensching 1926; Harrison 1991 on V. *Aen.* 10.101ff.), invoked in l. 1: it is not the community attending the service who has to be silent in the presence of the god, but the highest god Jupiter is asked to be silent in order to hear the song on Augustus. Note also the wordplay: *Calliope—Caesaris—camina—Caesar—canitur*. For word play and verbal echoes, cf. Cairns (1984) 134ff. and 164f.

¹¹⁶ See Cairns (1984) 165ff., Kierdorf (1995) 169ff., Binder (1971) 112ff. Propertius' and Virgil's text have been read as a description of a painting representing the battle of Actium located in the temple of Apollo on the Palatine by Camps *loc. cit.*

¹¹⁷ As in 4.9 he skips over the fight with Cacus amply described by Virgil; cf. Hubbard (1975) 135f.

¹¹⁸ *est...portus* (15) like *lucus erat* (4.1.3), *Lanuvium...est* (4.8.3). In 17 Goold is right to accept Markland's *Leucas* for *pelagus*, it suits perfectly the learned style of the passage with its accumulation of names. Cf. also Cairns (1984) 154ff.

and Cleopatra—are characterised antithetically,¹¹⁹ and the scene for the battle is set by the first movement of the two naval forces, described in a beautiful image of their reflections in the water (25f.). From then onward prominence is given to the presence of Apollo, placing himself over the ship of Augustus and described in warlike dress (27–36).¹²⁰ From his place above the ship Apollo delivers a kind of general's speech to Augustus (37–54),¹²¹ addressing him as the descendant of the Trojan royal family and promising him victory, since his cause is right and in line with the destiny of Rome, whereas that of his enemy is wrong.¹²² Help of Apollo's bow wins victory, and Caesar's star is applauding from heaven (59f.)¹²³ while Cleopatra retreats and the gods of the sea rejoice in Augustus' victory (55–66).¹²⁴ At the end the *aition* of Apollo's temple is summed up in a curious way (67f.): the temple was dedicated to Apollo because one shot of his sank ten ships, a detail not found elsewhere in the tradition.

A coda (69–86) is appended where the poet rejoices in the victory at a banquet¹²⁵ where one talks of various other military achievements

¹¹⁹ He never mentions Antony; he characterizes the enemy force with *femineae* in 22, and later with *femina* (57) and *mulier* (65); Apollo in his speech speaks of *regia vela* (46); cf. Kierdorf *loc. cit.* Note also the word play on *aequore*—*aequa* in 19f. (surrounded in many words aliterating in *a*—: *Athamana*—*aquae*—*Actia*—*altera*—*apta*—*Augusta*, in the whole section 15ff.).

¹²⁰ Goold is right in accepting Lipsius' *ante* for *unda* in 28, but the transmitted *nam* is defensible. The first comparison 33f. is taken from Troy, thus preparing for the address to Augustus as descendant of the Trojans; the second one introduces Apollo as the slayer of dark forces (Pytho) and prepares for the image of the Centaurs in 49.

¹²¹ Cf. Kierdorf (1995) 171ff.

¹²² The address of Augustus as descendent of Aeneas continues the motif of the resurrection of Troy from 1a and b (*Alba Longa* in particular), and so does the mention of Romulus *auguria* (see above p. 361). The speech of Apollo above the ship resembles the address to the fleeing Trojans in 1a.

¹²³ Cf. Cairns (1984) 167f.

¹²⁴ The middle section is arranged in a crescendo of subsections of decreasing length: 15–36, 37–54, 55–68 (cf. below p. 392 on 4.10). It is a prime example of Propertius' adaptation of Callimachean lyric narrative: We are held in suspense by the lengthy description of the place and the forces which static verbs: *est*—*stetit*—*erat*: this is followed by a contrast movement (a beautiful sea picture, continuing the motif of light of 25f.)—rest (Apollo appears suddenly, but again stands (*astitit*) above the ship; the contrast is also made explicit in ll. 27f., where Goold rightly accepts *non* for *nam* from the *deteriores*, and Lipsius' *ante* for *unda* is much better than *una* in the *deteriores*). Action is further suspended by Apollo's speech. Then the main event is only referred to in two lines and the narrative ends with the nice cheerful image of the sea gods.

¹²⁵ Cf. Griffin (1985) 33 with n. 2.

of the *princeps*.¹²⁶ By the contrast 'war—peace' we are reminded that Apollo is also the god of peace and music (69f.).¹²⁷ Thus the poet is back to the opening poems of the third book, where he had, in the topical way of the *recusatio*, presented himself as a poet of peace, who cannot sing about military achievements. In 3.1–3, war and peace had still been presented as contrasting topics; now Propertius can sing about both, just as his patron Apollo has two sides. As the god of music and poetry Apollo has Bacchus as his twin, who also inspires poets (75f.)¹²⁸ and who already figured in this function in 3.2.9f.

By integrating explicitly the 'whole' Callimachus, also the aetiological one, into his poetical program, Propertius goes beyond the third book: now he can truly claim to have reached the goal to be admitted to the grove of Callimachus, to have become the Roman Callimachus in the full sense. However, already at the end of 3.4 Propertius had done a step toward the attitude he displays in 4.6: if he could not be a poet of war, he nevertheless presented himself as a Roman citizen applauding Augustus' triumph in the *via Appia* (3.4.22). At the end of 4.6 the poet depicts himself among other Roman citizens, talking of the same military achievements (Crassus' defeat, 83f.) as in 3.4.9f. and 5.47f. Thus Propertius represents the integration of the national poetry into his Callimachean program not unlike Horace in the fourth book of his *Carmina*: in *C.* 4.2 he presents himself as Propertius in 3.4: a bystander who applauds Augustus' triumph in the *via sacra*; and in *C.* 4.5 and 15 he praises Augustus' achievements in peace rather than in war, and 4.15 depicts the poet in a banquet similar to that of Propertius' 4.6.

Horace, with his close personal relationship to the *princeps*, could plausibly integrate panegyrics about Augustus into his personal poetry by abandoning his earlier priestly attitude and presenting himself, so to speak, as a simple Roman citizen offering his private feelings of gratitude to Augustus. But we find precisely this stance already

¹²⁶ The speech in 80–84 formally echoes in miniature the speech of Apollo. The concluding couplet (85f.), with the rays of the morning sun being reflected in the bowl of the drinking poet, recalls the image of the reflection of the arms of the enemy armies in 25f. *Iniciat* (86) supports Dousa's *icta* (for *picta*) in 26. For the significance of the final part of the elegy, cf. also Cairns (1984) 141ff., 152.

¹²⁷ Whereas in ll. 31ff. he was the god of war, cf. Mader (1990); the contrast god of music—warrior is conventional, cf. Mader 326 n. 7.

¹²⁸ For *potis* for *positis*, see Günther (1997a) 112.

foreshadowed in Propertius 3.4. As the programmatic poems of the third book referred to those of Horace's *Odes*, now in 4.6, at the peak of his panegyric poetry, Propertius defines himself again in reference to Horace:¹²⁹ as the *vates*, who performs a sacrifice and asks for silence, he is close to C. 3.1, and the 'personal' end is marked in Propertius, as in C. 3.1, by a Pindaric 'Abbruchsformel'. The poet of 4.6 *can* sing of war, of national topics, as the poet of wine and love, he has been and still is. By putting his poetry of love and wine under the patronage of Bacchus, he qualifies it not any longer as small, private poetry: Bacchus is represented in 75f. as inspiring poetic *ingenium*; he is the inspiring god and conqueror of dark forces of Horace's C. 2.19 and 3. 25,¹³⁰ the patron of the Pindaric Propertius in 3.17. Accordingly, in 4.6 Propertius presents in a stylistically highly refined poem and in a prime example of creative adaptation of Callimachean lyric narrative both a dense reflection on his role as a poet and, at the same time, as Cairns (1984) 162ff. has shown, a meaningful interpretation of the achievements of the Augustan restoration.

If Propertius treats the battle of Actium in the quasi-hymnic frame he chooses in 4.6, renouncing a description of the battle itself and giving all prominence to Apollo, at the same time, he respects the requests of the nonepic genre, but he also is a mouthpiece of official ideology: Augustus himself refrained from putting himself at the center of the monument of his triumph, he demonstratively stepped back and left center stage to his divine protector, thus giving a supreme example of *dis te minorem quod geris, imperas* 'you rule because you hold yourself inferior to the gods' (Hor. C. 3.6.5). And if Propertius at the end presents Apollo as the god of peace and music, this

¹²⁹ The reference to inimical forces of Apollo like the Centaurs and Pytho refer to concepts expressed in Hor. C. 3.4 in particular (cf. Fraenkel 1957, 273ff.; Nisbet-Rudd (2004) *ad loc.*), as does Calliope (cf. also 3.2.16 and 3.3); cf. Cairns (1984) 144ff. This role the poet develops naturally with the change in the political situation from the violence of the years of civil war and the struggle for power to the peace and security of the *pax Augusta*. The specific form it took in Horace and Propertius' late poetry, conceived at about the same time, is distinctly reminiscent of each other, and the affinity between the stance, Propertius takes in his last book and Horace in the fourth book of the *Odes* testifies not only, as Propertius' third book, to the influence of Horace on Propertius, but to the mutual influence of both poets upon each other; as regards the supposed negative judgment of Horace on Propertius' poetry see above p. 362 n. 49).

¹³⁰ See Krasser (1995) 92ff., Nisbet-Hubbard (1978) on 2.19, and Nisbet-Rudd (2004) on 3.25; see also Griffin (1985) 43.

corresponds precisely to the 'Bildprogramm' of the temple on the Palatine with its accent on peace and devotion.¹³¹

National or Panegyric poetry has not been particularly popular among modern critics, after R. Syme's epoch-making book in particular, and Propertius' poem has found few modern admirers.¹³² However, the above interpretation may at least have given a hint why this highly sophisticated poem may be regarded, together with 4.7, 8, and 11, as a peak of Propertius' art.

*Seventh elegy*¹³³

In the first of the pair of poems on Cynthia, the *eidolon* of the recently deceased woman appears to the poet, who is living with another companion, and addresses him in a dream. The speech of the ghost, which occupies the main body of the text, falls into four sections of increasing length (12–14–22–24 ll.): Cynthia accuses the poet of neglect of her memory and insufficient attention to her funeral (13–34); then she goes on to describe Propertius' new household with the new woman, accusing his slave Lygdamus of scheming against her (35–48); yet, she is still as devoted to him as she was during her life, and thus dwells now in the elysium of faithful lovers (49–70). Her *mandata* to the poet include the request to free her favorite slave girl, but concern her memory and grave in particular, which she asks him to adorn with an epigram.¹³⁴ She concludes with the confident hope that, despite the poet's infidelity, his bones will once rest beside hers (71–94). The speech is framed by an introduction (1–12), in which the poet from vivid memory, as one is led to think, describes the appearance of the recently deceased in detail, and by a concluding couplet (95f.) in which the disappearance of the ghost is

¹³¹ Cf. Zanker (1987) 91 who justly refers to Propertius; cf. also Krasser (1995) 86ff.; Apollo is represented holding the lyra, not the bow; see Zanker 85 and pl. 186, also Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) on Hor. C. 1.31.1.

¹³² But cf., e.g., Cairns (1984) and Hollis p. 116f. in this volume.

¹³³ There is a very useful modern commentary to the poem (with ample introduction) by Dimundo (1990); 4.7 and 4.8 are also the subject of the dissertation of Komp (1988), which includes an useful appendix on the use of Homer (212ff.); cf. also Hubbard (1975) 149ff., Warden (1980), Papanghelis (1987) 145ff., Günther (2002) 28ff.

¹³⁴ For the models of ll. 85f., see Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 90f.

described in words distinctly reminiscent of the famous Homeric lines on the ghost of Patroclus (*Il.* 23.99ff.; echoed also in *V. Aen.* 2.792ff. and 6.700ff.). This reveals that in fact the appearance of Cynthia's ghost as a whole has been modeled on that of Patroclus to Achilles in the twenty-third book of the *Iliad*.¹³⁵

4.7 may be regarded as a program poem complementary to 4.6—as the first half of the book has two introductory poems, 4.1a and 4.1b. 4.7 is central to the understanding of Propertius' transformation of love poetry in the fourth book, it forms the center from which the love poems of the book unfold. As yet another mimetic monologue of a dead woman, it refers back to 4.5 and, with its protagonist, forward to 4.8. But above all, like 4.3, 4.7 inverts central motifs of Latin love elegy by a reversion of the gender role: it reshapes the topic of 4.3 so as to prepare it for its ultimate development in the last elegy 4.11.¹³⁶

4.7 is the peak of Propertius' self-interpretation as a poet of love: the poem inverts the central topic of his love poetry, that of death in love. The 'Liebestod' of the poet,¹³⁷ the eternity of love beyond the grave is the highest expression of the sentimental attitude of Latin love elegy. The death fantasies, where the poet protests the endurance of *his* love even beyond death, imagines his funeral and is weary about the behavior of his, alas, not all too devoted companion, is a central motif of the programmatic poems at the beginning of the elegy book (namely Prop. 2.1 and 2.13, or Tib. 1.1). It corresponds to the declarations of eternal love despite the disillusionment of the abandoned poet at the end of the book (cf. Prop. 1.19, 2.9). 4.7 presents this motif in a reversion of the gender role: now the woman has died before her lover, and she complains about *his* behavior at *her* funeral.¹³⁸ She, the great unfaithful, complains of *his* infidelity, protesting her devotion to him in life and death. Thus, as in 4.3, the situation of the abandoned elegiac lover is reversed, and Cynthia's rival is presented in a way similar to that in which the rival of the poet is described, e.g., in 2.16.

¹³⁵ Cf. Dimundo (1990) 27ff.

¹³⁶ Cf. Dimundo (1990) 88ff.

¹³⁷ Cf. Günther (2002) 29ff.; Griffin (1985) 45f., 142ff.; Papanghelis (1987); Müller (1995); Foulon (1996); Maltby pp. 160ff. in this volume.

¹³⁸ The antithetic references to 1.19 have been noted by Dimundo (1990) pp. 41ff.

The poet's love beyond the grave is the ultimate grand gesture of his grand, entirely altruistic sentiment. He declares this feeling in the moment of ultimate despair and disillusionment and offers it to an egoistic and materialistic woman, who abandoned him and does not deserve this devotion, because for him it is the only way in which at least he can live a sentiment that is denied to him by his partner. It is a kind of intentional self-deception, and Propertius had thus interpreted elegiac love in the farewell poem to Cynthia at the end of the previous book, 3.24/25.¹³⁹ This poem had been a farewell to this kind of love poetry, love poetry as an expression of exclusive devotion to a woman, to the illusion to be able to live an *eo ipso* unrequited feeling, a farewell which, at the same time, freed the poet to another, more realistic attitude toward love. In 4.7 the poet presents himself in this different attitude: he has taken to heart the advice of the 'Epicurean' Horace, to which he alludes in 3.24/25, to content himself with easy relationships, with a *Venus parabilis*. Already in other poems (as 2.22a–24) the poet had tried to console himself, in vain, in this way: now he seems, at long last, to have done so successfully. And thus the end of love is not marked by the death of the poet; it is not the poet who dies in love—now it is Cynthia, the object of his great unfulfilled love, who is dead, and *her* being dead symbolizes the irrevocable death of elegiac love. Yet, Cynthia's shadow haunts the poet still, his grand feelings still visit him from time to time in dreams, in which the ghost of the woman, who incarnated this love, appears to him.

And now she assumes the role in which he had formerly depicted himself. As he protested his eternal love, now she protests hers in a grand gesture toward him, the unfaithful, who does not deserve it. But how different is Cynthia's magnanimity¹⁴⁰ from that of the poet, the tempestuous lover, the young man who desperately talks himself

¹³⁹ Cf. Dimundo (1990) pp. 13f., Günther (1997b).

¹⁴⁰ There are, of course, literary models for the permissiveness of women toward men who abandoned them, of wives in particular, e.g., Deianeira in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, but also Pamphile and Habrotonon in Menander's *Epitrepontes*. And, of course, putting up with the sexual adventures of the male companion is part of the 'canon' of traditional wifely virtues, both in Greek and Roman antiquity, of that of subordination (*gerere morem*) in particular; it is a virtue also displayed by Cornelia in 4.11; cf. also Treggiani (1991) 185ff.

into an altruistic love toward an undeserving woman:¹⁴¹ the dead Cynthia shows the attitude of a mature woman; already in the description of her external appearance the fact shone through that she, who died before the poet, is slightly older,¹⁴² and thus the poem, where Cynthia first appears in the fourth book, continues the motif of old age applied to Cynthia in 3.24/25. Cynthia's magnanimity is the realistic attitude of a mature woman toward a younger lover. She combines this feeling with the hope to be united with him after death; she presents herself living in the Elysium of true lovers, into which the poet had once dreamed himself and into which he desired his beloved woman to enter with him. Cynthia is alone in this paradise, lamenting together with other beauties of myth her grief about the wounds she received in life with an unfaithful man.

In Propertius' earlier poetry Cynthia *was* the inhabitant of an elysium of beautiful women, but then she was so because of her beauty, undeservedly: she was imagined there by a poet willing to condone everything to a beautiful woman. If now she mirrors his feeling of magnanimity, she inverts the cynical feelings of the elegiac *domina*. Yet, she does not hope for a happy reunion in this paradise. Her hope for a reunion she expresses only before she leaves—not into this Elysium, but—as the ghost, the shadow she was at the beginning—into the world of shades; after speaking of her grave, she expresses only the hope that one day his bones may rest beside hers.¹⁴³ The Cynthia of 4.7, the mature woman, has learned to renounce the hope for a fulfillment of her desires in life, and thus the poet himself who wrote this poem has found a relaxed attitude. As the woman of 4.7 mirrors the feelings of the male elegiac lover, she mirrors the feelings of the poet now. As the elegiac *domina*, this woman is a product of the poet's imagination and emotional attitude; but now she is the product of the imagination of a different man,

¹⁴¹ See Günther (2002) 26. At the utmost he may assume a kind of *laissez-faire* attitude as in 2.31/32 (see below pp. 383, 387), similar to the attitude of Priamos and the Trojan elders toward Helen in the *teichoskopía* in Homer's *Iliad* (3.156ff.).

¹⁴² This may well reflect a real experience; in the 'romantic' adventures of young men with married women, the woman may often have been slightly older (for the age of marriage in Augustan times see Treggiani (1991, 398ff.). Lesbia (Clodia, born ca. 94 BC) appears to have been older than Catullus.

¹⁴³ This has models in real epitaphs, see Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 153f.; cf. also Lissberger (1934) 96f.; Shackleton Bailey (1982); Yardley (1983); Griffin (1985) 157f. It mirrors the insecurity of 'Jenseitshoffnung' of the ancients, see Latte (1960) 286f.; Burkert (1994) 34; cf. also Lissberger (60ff.).

the imagination of someone who has shed his solipsistic attitude, developing a remarkable sensitivity toward the emotional patterns of the female psyche, of someone who, renouncing the illusions of great feelings, has become content with a *Venus parabilis* but fills his dreams with the memories of a love that died and thus lives it the only way it can be lived in the real world.

Eighth Elegy

The second poem on Cynthia pretends to recount an anecdote of the poet's association with her, a quarrel¹⁴⁴ at the poet's house on the Esquilin,¹⁴⁵ reminiscent of 3.8. The quarrel is caused by the poet consoling himself over Cynthia's infidelity in the company of two girls of easy virtue. We now are precisely in the situation of 2.21–24, the situation pointedly varied in the preceding poem (the concluding couplet of 4.7 (85f.) also describes Cynthia's complaints as uttered *querula . . . sub lite* 'in querulous indictment'). In 4.8 this situation is depicted in distinct imitation of the comic standard scene of the lover caught in flagrant adultery.¹⁴⁶ The reconciliation happens in a way quite different from that in 2.24, it occurs in a scene of jealousy. And this time it is not, as in 4.7, Cynthia, but the poet who pardons; it is he who assumes the relaxed *laissez-faire* attitude of a lover used to the whims of a difficult, but beautiful woman—a man who has come to terms with his lot, very much like the Horace of *C.* 1.32, when he contrasts his way of dealing with love to that of his friend Tibullus. And, of course, the jealousy of the woman has reassured Propertius of her love (cf. 3.8.11ff.) as much as did her declarations of fidelity in 4.7.

This comic masterpiece may be regarded as the prime example of what Newman identified as the iambic aspect of Propertius' poetry.¹⁴⁷ In the first distich the subject of the poem is announced

¹⁴⁴ Cynthia's complaints in the preceding elegy too were described in the concluding distich as a quarrel; 4.9 continues this motif with the 'quarrel' between Hercules and the girls in the grove.

¹⁴⁵ For the location, see now Grüner (1993).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 921ff.; *Merc.* 783ff.; cf. Fedeli (1965) *ad loc.* (p. 205).

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Newman (1997, 328ff.). Wilamowitz called it, even before 4.11, the true *regina elegiarum* (Wilamowitz 1913, 301 n. 1).

similarly to the preambles of the aetiological elegies (4.8.1f. very much resemble 4.2.1f.); in fact, but for *hac nocte* 'this night', one might take this as the beginning of an aetiological poem.¹⁴⁸ The text continues (3–14)¹⁴⁹ with a description of Lanuvium and the rite connected with its holy snake; this resembles the beginning of 4.4, and again one might almost suspect that some *aition* relating to Lanuvium will be told.¹⁵⁰ Only in l. 15f. is it revealed that Cynthia has gone away to Lanuvium with a lover under the pretense of a visit to the temple of Juno (*Sospita*), and thus the six distichs on Lanuvium are balanced by five distichs describing the formidable woman traveling in her coach on the *via Appia* together with her degenerate lover (15–26).¹⁵¹ After these 24 ll. of introduction, the scene is set for the central event of the poem: a little party at the poet's house where he consoles himself with two girls. In another 24 ll. (27–50) the details of the banquet are described with the poet sandwiched between the girls (29–36),¹⁵² served with wine by his slave Lygdamus (37f.) and amused with music and mime by a dwarf (39–42).¹⁵³ He is, however, haunted by bad omens (43–46) and tries in vain to forget Cynthia (47f.),¹⁵⁴ when she suddenly appears at the door (49f.).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Hubbard (1975) 154.

¹⁴⁹ Housman's transposition of 9f. after 12 is too much an improvement to be disregarded (alternatively one may, however, contemplate Richmond's lacuna after 12); I think there is much to be said for Birt's *conditur* for *creditur* in 10 (*corripit—canistra—anguino—conditur—ore—castae—colla*); yet with the archaic *anguino*, *ore* may indeed be defended as dative (cf. Schuster 1922, 310f.; Neumann 1925, 18) despite the difficulty of the short *e*.

¹⁵⁰ Inverting Heinze's characterization of the elegiac narrative (see p. 371) one may call this 'aitiologische Episierung der Liebeselegie'.

¹⁵¹ For the deletion of ll. 19ff., see Günther (1997a) 126f., 45 n. 191; for the text in l.22 see Kershaw (1994b).

¹⁵² In 36 the transmitted *concubitus* is correct (cf. above p. 359 n. 28); it is a joke for the expected *discubitus* (conjectured by Palmer and regarded with sympathy by many editors, accepted by Goold). Lying between two girls like that at supper cannot properly be described as *dis-cubitus*, but must rather be called *con-cubitus*.

¹⁵³ *Nile, tuus* (39) need not be altered; but something like Palmer's *Byblis* is correct for the transmitted *Phyllis*, and so is Baehrens' *haec*, easily corrupt at the beginning of the line to the transmitted *et* (omission of initial letters; Butler-Barber (1933) *ad loc.* are right both in their rejection of *Phyllis* and regarding the construction of 40).

¹⁵⁴ *Solus* in 48 has a point and should by no means be altered to *totus* (Krafft; cf. already Butler-Barber (1933, *ad loc.*): from what precedes we would indeed expect *totus*—or at the utmost *solum* 'only (at Lanuvium)'; but with *ei mihi* 'alas', marking a mild anakoluthon, the poet becomes aware of the fact that being away with his thoughts with Cynthia he feels alone—even in such charming company.

The rest of the poem is divided into two parts of about equal length (51–70 and 71–88): Cynthia, beautiful in her fury (51f.), aggressively disrupts the peace of the night in a loud and grotesque scene (53–58), alarming the whole neighborhood (59f.),¹⁵⁵ throws the girls out of the house so that they have to take refuge in a nearby tavern (61f.). Then Cynthia turns to Propertius and Lygdamus—here in the role of the comic slave protecting the amorous adventures of his master—beating them as well (63–68), until the latter appeals to his master who is, however, unable help him (69f.). Now the poet himself holds out his hands toward Cynthia in supplication (71f.). She delivers a speech stating her conditions for making peace (73–80).¹⁵⁶ The poet accepts (81) and Cynthia, happy of her victory (82), purifies the house (83–85) and her unfaithful lover (86) after her revenge—a scene reminiscent of Ulysses purifying the house after the killing of the suitors and the unfaithful servant girls (an allusion balancing the reference to the *Iliad* in 4.7). In the end, Cynthia and the poet are reconciled on a newly strewn bed (87f.).¹⁵⁷ Thus the poem leads us from the mysterious atmosphere of the beginning; through the vivid, partly grotesque descriptions of Cynthia's journey, the banquet and the dramatic actions of the quarrel; and back into a quasi-religious atmosphere, which is, of course, touched with subtle irony and crowned by a frivolous end.

Still, to read this lively poem about a Cynthia, very much alive indeed, must come as a surprise after the solemn conclusion of 4.7. There Cynthia had been presented as dead and visiting the unfaithful poet in a situation similar, yet incompatible with that of 4.8. 4.8.1 insists on referring to a recent event (*hac nocte*). What then is the point of this sequence? Does it have one? Or could it perhaps

¹⁵⁵ There is no need to change *lumina* (quite suggestive in this night scene); jealous Cynthia's *elata lumina* make one think of the torches of the *Erotes* in 2.29 A (l. 5).

¹⁵⁶ For ll. 77f. cf. Kershaw (1994a).

¹⁵⁷ The transmitted *respondi* and *toto* in 88 are correct; they are a joke: in response to Cynthia changing every sheet of the bed the poet 'functioned properly again in regard to sex' (thus rightly Camps (1965, *ad loc.*); and, indeed, the newly strewn bed is used in full measure. Moreover the repetition of *respondi* and *toto* from above fits the style of the passage: *indixit—leges—respondi—legibus* (81)—*imperio* (82)—*tetigere* (83)—*tergit* (84)—*imperat—totas—iterum—mutare* (85)—*terque—tetigit* (86)—*ita—mutato* (87)—*respondi—toto* (88). There is also an obscene double entendre in *solvimus arma*, already noted by Passerat (cited by Fedeli 1965, *ad loc.*) who gives two alternative interpretations ('obscene, arma quibus pugnatur in certamine nocturno . . . an . . . pugnam et rixam omnem diremimus'), which both are correct.

have arisen by the carelessness of a compiler?¹⁵⁸ In fact, even the introduction of 4.8 alone builds up to an *aprosdoketon*: the sudden appearance of Cynthia after the tale of the sacred cave at Lanuvium (3ff.) that made one expect a piece of aetiology. The suggestive atmosphere of 3ff.¹⁵⁹ continues the 'night thoughts' of Cynthia's ghost returning to the underworld at the end of 4.7. To be sure, *hac nocte* is puzzling. It suggests understanding 4.7 and 4.8 as referring to real events from the relationship of the poet with the same real woman and, at the same time, pointedly sabotages the expectations of the pseudo-dramatic structure of the elegy cycle with its creation of the fiction of relating the real love story of the poet. If anything, the sequence 4.7/4.8 points to the fact that Cynthia is not one real person but rather a poetic fiction, reflecting the poet's sentimental experience but not portraying it realistically. Somehow the sequence 4.7/4.8 recalls such dramatic pairs as 2.29a/b or 2.26a/b (2.26.30–58 need not be further divided into 2.26b and c). Regarding 2.29a/b, the poems are linked pseudo-dramatically. 29a takes place at night; in b it is morning (*mane* (2.29.23) pseudo-etymologically recalls *manere* from 2.29.28). Yet, the situation in which the poet finds himself at the end of 2.29a is, precisely in its similarity, not really compatible with that of 2.29b. Similarly, the connection between 2.26a and b can be described as that of *rêve* and *reverie* (cf. also Macleod 1983, 196ff.) whose interpretation of 2.26 is valid irrespective of the problem of unity): the dream of 2.26a is continued, as if it had been reality, in 2.26b. Does then 2.29b suggest that the unreal scene of 2.29a has been a dream, although it has not been explicitly described as such? And, of course, it *is* a product of the poet's fantasy. In any case, already these poems show a use of dramatic pairing that undermines its function as creating the fiction of biographical reality. Does then, perhaps, 4.8, following upon 4.7, reveal that the dream of 4.7, explicitly described as such, not reflect an actual event from the life of the same woman as that of 4.8, and thus, that the *domina* of

¹⁵⁸ Butler-Barber (1933) p. xxviii, understandably feel undecided between the two views: 'Some argue that only the poet can have devised the bizarre juxtaposition of Ell. vii and viii, others that he is the one person who could have done no such thing.'

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Newman (1997) 329: 'the suggestive, Eleusinian opening; the innocent and nubile maidens in their encounter with the serpent—and the worldly Cynthia, hoping for a bit of fun'.

Propertius' love poetry is a creation of his poetic sensitivity, and that his dream in 4.7 is his dream of the woman that corresponds to the ideal of the death fantasies of his earlier verse? And does 4.8 perhaps also reveal that the attitude that made the poet live in quite different circumstances—i.e., being content to live his higher emotional aspirations in dream, fantasy, and recollection, is a distanced 'Horatian' down-to-earth-attitude, ready to bow relaxed and self-ironically to the whims of a beautiful woman, while indulging from time to time in more facile sexual adventures? In any case, it is an attitude foreshadowed already in 2.31/32,¹⁶⁰ a poem explicitly alluded to by the mention of the *porticus Pompeia* as a notorious popular rendezvous in 4.8.75 (cf. 2.32.11f.). After the *adieu* to Cynthia in 3.24/25, Propertius' elegiac *domina* is resurrected in 4.7 and 4.8; and, it appears, Propertius chose to give the last word to laughter, the 'laughter of resurrection', as Newman¹⁶¹ put it, in a scene, in which Cynthia—a Cynthia not resigned to renounce, as in 4.7, but victorious—is again, ironically, elevated to quasi-heroic status.

*Ninth elegy*¹⁶²

On 4.9 follows another poem on fight and victory with many humorous and mock-heroic touches, an elegy purporting to explain a cult practice connected with an altar situated on the *Forum Bovarium* and known as *Herculis Invicti Ara Maxima*:¹⁶³ the exclusion of women from its worship. It is the only poem that does not indicate a particular *aition* as the topic of the poem in a preamble; with the πρόσωπον τηλαυγές of its pompous opening the poem plunges right away into the narrative of a legend, which—as 4.6.—once again has its counterpart in the eighth book of Virgil's *Aeneid* (185ff.; already *Amphitryoniades* (l. 1) echoes *Amphitryoniadae* (V. *Aen.* 8. 202)): the cattle that Hercules

¹⁶⁰ For the unity of what is numbered according to a separation in the *deteriores* 2.31 and 32, see Günther (1997a) 31.

¹⁶¹ Newman (1997) 405; cf. also p. 164.

¹⁶² Mutschler (1996) gives a good account (115ff.). Cf. also the important paper of Cairns (1992), who brings out the cultic and religious dimensions of the poem, and Anderson (1992).

¹⁶³ On his return from the East in 29 BC Augustus entered the city on 13 August, one day after the ceremonies at the *Ara Maxima*, an association presupposed by V. *Aen.* 8.100ff.; cf. Binder (1971) 42ff., 145ff., 264.

drove off from Erythea, the mythical island located outside the straits of Gibraltar, after slaying its owner Geryon, was later robbed by Hercules' treacherous host Cacus, a monster living in a cavern on the Aventine; then it was recovered by the hero (1–20).¹⁶⁴ Thirsty after the fight Hercules asks the priestesses of a shrine of a female goddess, located in a sacred grove—apparently *Bona Dea*,¹⁶⁵ who had a temple not far away on the other side of the *Circus Maximus* (dedicated to *Bona Dea Subsaxara*)¹⁶⁶ to be allowed to drink from a fountain in the holy precinct, but the high priestess denies it to him, since no men are allowed on the premises.¹⁶⁷ Furious, Hercules breaks in, quenches his thirst¹⁶⁸ and in revenge bans women from the cult of the *Ara Maxima* founded by him.¹⁶⁹ In conclusion, *ara* 'altar' is derived pseudo-etymologically from Greek ἄρα 'curse' (via *devota* 'cursed'), and *maxima* 'largest' from *manus* 'hand' (21–70).¹⁷⁰ Not ineptly, when one thinks of the hymnic character of the piece, pointed out by Cairns (1992), a quasi-hymnic finale of two couplets (73f., 71f.; thus probably rightly Schneidewin)¹⁷¹ is appended: a prayer in which Hercules,¹⁷² called *Sance* by the name of the ancient Sabine

¹⁶⁴ For the tradition of the story, cf. Sbordone (1941) 149ff.; Buchheit (1963) 116ff. Propertius' account skips over details occurring in Virgil's account (Euander, the location of the cave on the Aventine, the killing of Cacus, only described in detail by Virgil; see Buchheit 1963, 117), but does not disagree with the essentials of his version (there are other reports ascribing the foundation of the *Ara Maxima* to Euander or to companions of Hercules). The *Bona Dea* connection, however, appears only in Propertius; see further Heinze (1919) 82f., Becker (1971) 451, Galinsky (1972) 153ff., Warden, (1982) and Mutschler (1996).

¹⁶⁵ The goddess is not named explicitly; Latte (1960) 229 n. 3 has doubts about the identification.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. also Grimal (1953) 36.

¹⁶⁷ For the Callimachean model (*h.* 5), cf. Becker (1971) 451f.

¹⁶⁸ The thirst of Hercules for alcoholic drinks—not water—is, of course, topical; cf. Padilla (1998) 28, also Galinsky (1972) 73ff., 82ff. For an iconographic study of glutton and drunkard Hercules, see Wolf (1993).

¹⁶⁹ There are, of course, other examples for the exclusion of women from Hercules' cult, cf. Plut. *De Pyth. Or.* 404A; this was even proverbial (cf. *PG* p. 32, 304 Gaisford).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Günther (1998) 255. Regarding the text of the passage, there can hardly be any doubt about Jacobs' transposition of 65f. after 42 (= 66, interpolated in lacuna); in 70 Heinsius' *externi* (with *Herculis P*) is much better than his widely accepted banal *aeternum* (with *Herculea*), but Richmond's *Oestrurni* (cf. Avien. *Or. Mar.* 90) has also a good chance to be correct.

¹⁷¹ See Günther (1998) 249, 255; cf. also *ibid.* for *Sancum* in 70 and *Sance* in 72; but cf. also Newman (1997) 379. For the Callimachean model of 71f. see Hollis p. 122 in this volume.

¹⁷² Cf. Abel (1930) 87.

deity *Semo Sancus* associated with him¹⁷³, is asked to be favorable to the poet and his book. Again the epithet *Sancus* is derived etymologically from *sancire*, a word prominently used throughout the poem,¹⁷⁴ as other etymological *aitia* are hinted at previously—e.g., in ll. 3 (*Palatia* via *pecorosa* from *balare*), 5f. (*Velabrum* from *velificare*) and 19f. (*Forum Bovarium* from *bos*), and there are ‘hidden’ etymologies or pseudo-etymologies throughout the poem.¹⁷⁵ Thus, the reason why no specific *aition* is announced in a preamble, becomes apparent.

The poem shows all the features of lyrical narrative mentioned above (p. 371); stylistically, it strikes a subtle balance between a sonorous style of epic (e.g., in the grand opening lines) and playful lightness, full of repetitions and puns. With its fine humor the poem is a fitting aetiologial counterpart to 4.8, and, at the same time, forms a contrast to the following elegy. 4.10 is a ‘straight’ celebration of the virtues of the Roman warrior. In 4.9 the ‘martial’ aspect is treated with subtle irony: the poem does not dwell on Hercules’ powers, but rather presents a scene where the hero finds himself as an *exclusus amator* in a *paraklausithyron*¹⁷⁶ amidst a beautiful landscape scenery.¹⁷⁷ there is sanctuary with women devoted to its service, women represented as laughing girls¹⁷⁸—echoing Cynthia’s laughter in the preceding poem. Propertius refers to Virgil’s account as Hellenistic poets refer to Homer:¹⁷⁹ he skips over the fight described

¹⁷³ Cf. Butler-Barber (1933) on ll. 71–74.

¹⁷⁴ See Günther (1998) 255f.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Günther (1998).

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Anderson (1964), Fedeli (1994); cf. also Newman (1997) 380, 472. The rites of *Bona Dea* may serve as an excuse for the woman to escape the surveillance of the man (Tib. 1.6.21f.), as religious duties serve as an excuse for Cynthia in 4.8 or 2.32.3ff. For the cultic associations, see Cairns (1992). If one thinks of Propertius’ fondness for the reversion of the gender role in Book 4 (see above p. 357), one may find it significant that ll. 45–50 we find a reference to the Omphale story, with its exchange of clothes and gender roles, popular in the Hellenistic and Roman period (cf., e.g., Ov. *Fast.* 2.303ff., *Her.* 9.53ff.).

¹⁷⁷ For the description of the grove as a *locus amoenus*, see Cairns (1992) 77ff., Mutschler (1996) 121.

¹⁷⁸ They are called *puellae* by Hercules, the priestess that appears is from the very start described in a slightly solemn way (52), but she still calls her companions *puellae*, (59), however at the end of her speech it is revealed that she herself is an ‘old woman’ *anus* (61). The reader may be as disappointed as thirsty Hercules refused to drink.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Kerkhecker (1997) 143ff.

in Virgil and instead fills the story with circumstantial detail:¹⁸⁰ a divine hero of myth is reduced to everyday life.¹⁸¹ No established figure of Greek mythology lent himself more easily for such an exercise than Hercules, whose superhuman powers had been exploited for comic purposes from earliest times onward.¹⁸² But when one realizes that in Propertius' poem we encounter the Stoic hero, adapted to the imperial propaganda of his time,¹⁸³ the sufferer of *mille labores* and thus a mythological archetype for Virgil's Aeneas,¹⁸⁴ this adaptation acquires a further dimension, which subtly yet firmly integrates the poem into the panegyric frame of the book. The poem is humorous, yet it is not a satire; it is full of grace and subtle irony, yet in the description of the sanctuary there is both: the laughing girls, the beauty of nature, and the evocation of an atmosphere of the sacred with its darkness and its light.¹⁸⁵ This poem does not sabotage the panegyric aspects of the topic; rather it integrates it into the realm of the subtle *χάρτις* of Alexandrian poetry.

Tenth elegy

This poem, which Newman¹⁸⁶ has fittingly called a 'parade elegy' of the panegyrist, is, with its 48 ll., the shortest of the collection. Is it a sign of a certain disengagement when the poet so exclusively, as

¹⁸⁰ He also refers antithetically to Virgil: Euander prides himself that the *limina* of his humble hut (*angusti tecti*), to which he invites *ingentem Aeneam*, received (*cepit*) once victorious Hercules, the god (362ff.); Hercules, who shouldered the earth (*recepta* l. 38), whom a small corner of the world finds (*accipit* l. 66) in an awkward situation, is denied access to the *devia* and *secreta limina* (ll. 27, 60) of the *tecta* (66) forbidden to men (55). Virgil depicts the harmony of male camaraderie, Propertius a precarious relationship between the sexes.

¹⁸¹ As, e.g., the Theseus of Callimachus' *Hecale*; cf. also Hollis p. 121 in this volume.

¹⁸² See Galinsky (1972) 81ff.; cf. also the Callimachean models referred to by Hollis p. 122 in this volume.

¹⁸³ Cf. Newman (1997) 375f., Heinze (1919), 81ff., Binder (1971) 141ff., Nisbet-Rudd (2004) p. 182 with further references; cf. also Galinsky (1972) 138ff.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Buchheit (1963) 122ff.

¹⁸⁵ See Günther (1998) 254ff.; Cairns (1992), 86ff. The travesty of Hercules as *exclusus amator* is by no means irreverent, as has sometimes been claimed: 'Propertius has taken great care to set this irreverent story of Hercules in a frame of proper religious solemnity'; Pilliger (1969) 183.

¹⁸⁶ Newman (1997) 124.

it seems, puts his *ingenium* at the service of civic poetry? Even if this suspicion may be partly correct, the poem is short to good effect; and while it will hardly be ranked among the highlights of the book, it still marks a forceful stretta toward the end of the collection¹⁸⁷—a procedure that has its counterpart in other Augustan poetry books.¹⁸⁸ And, of course, in its brevity the poem shows again all virtues of Callimachean lyric narrative characteristic of the book (see p. 371 above).

The poem tells the *aition* of the epithet of *Iuppiter Feretrius*, who had a small temple on the Capitoline, dilapidated by the time of Augustus and rebuilt by him.¹⁸⁹ The temple served various purposes, but there can be no doubt that the so-called *spolia opima* were placed there—i.e., the arms that were won if the Roman commander-in-chief killed the enemy general in single combat and stripped him of his arms; cf. Liv. 1.10¹⁹⁰ and 4.20 (with reference to what he had been told by Augustus himself). The topic was one of personal interest to Augustus and politically highly sensitive: the recent claim of Licinius Crassus in 29 BC to be added to the list was turned down by Augustus, obviously because he felt that it could undermine his position as the successor of Romulus, who was the first bearer of *spolia opima*.¹⁹¹ Propertius briefly recounts the three historic examples of the Roman commanders whose spoils were dedicated there, stressing already in the first couplet the officially approved number with the polyptoton *trina—tribus* in l. 2 (cf. also l. 45): Romulus (against Acro, king of the Sabine town Caecina), A. Cornelius Cossus (against Tolumnus in a war against Veii in the early fifth century BC), and M. Claudius Marcellus, who slew Vindomarus, the leader of the Insubres, in his victory at Clastidium in 222 BC. Already in the first story the poet includes some antiquarian detail reminiscent of 1a, and the following eloquent lament of the destruction of Veii (27f.)

¹⁸⁷ For another explanation, cf. Günther (1997a) 154.

¹⁸⁸ E.g., in Horace's first book of the *Satires* the second half is markedly shorter than the first one; the long last poem of the first half (1.5) is finished by 'Abbruchsformel' which refers explicitly to the great length (1.5.104), and this is balanced by a similar device at the end of 1.10 (l. 92).

¹⁸⁹ See above p. 360. The poem is, however, not connected directly with the restoration, which probably occurred much earlier (see Butler-Barber 1933, p. 375); their dedication of the temple had been mentioned already in Ennius' *Annals* (fr. 51).

¹⁹⁰ See Ogilvie (1965) *ad loc.*

¹⁹¹ Cf. Harrison (1989).

hides a trait of the poet's personal experience with violence and war, while at the same time, toward the end of the book, it refers back to the autobiographical episode in 1.119ff. and to the initial passage on ancient cities reduced to hamlets by the poet's time in 1.33ff. The three accounts fill the forty central lines of the poem; they are arranged so as to form a crescendo toward the end: each time the following episode is considerably shorter than the preceding one (20—14—6 ll.).¹⁹² This central section is framed by a preamble of four lines, where the poet, as usual, announces the topic of the poem (even the 'technical' Greek αἵτια is translated by *causas*) and, in a second couplet, resumes, in another reference to 1a, his initial claim to put his powers at the service of a great task.¹⁹³ Symmetrically two resuming concluding couplets derive the epithet *Feretrius* alternatively, as in the first aetiological poem, 4.2, either from *ferire* 'to slay' or from *ferre* 'to bear'.¹⁹⁴

*Eleventh elegy*¹⁹⁵

The finale of the book is formed by a much-admired poem: a funeral elegy for a certain Cornelia, daughter of an unidentified Cornelius Scipio and Scribonia, through whom Cornelia was related to the imperial household, since Scribonia later was married for a short time to Octavian, who fathered their daughter Iulia. Cornelia herself was married to L. Aemilius Paullus Lepidus (*consul suffectus* in 34 BC and Censor in 22 BC); as appears from ll. 63 and 68 of the poem, she bore him three children. Her brother, Cornelius Scipio, was consul in 16 BC, and we can infer from lines 65f. that Cornelia died in the same year, which should also be the approximate date of the elegy.

¹⁹² Passerat's plausible transposition of 25f. after 22 (see Butler-Barber 1933, *ad loc.*) is supported by the numerical symmetry which it creates.

¹⁹³ 3f. refer to 1.57–60 (*ascendo* echoes *scandentis* in 1.125); the wording reminds one of V. *Georg.* 3.8f.

¹⁹⁴ Similarly also Liv. 1.10.5; other ancient derivations are listed by Butler-Barber (1933) p. 375 and Fedeli (1965) p. 234f.; cf. also Maltby (1991) s.v.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. the important treatment of Reitzenstein (1969) and his little commentary (1970); cf. also Hubbard (1975) 145ff.

The piece is a monologue spoken by the dead woman and thus a last example of *ethopoiia*; in its mimetic character—Reinhard¹⁹⁶ points to its affinity with funeral mime—it echoes even formally its antithetic counterpart at the end of the first half of the book, 4.5 (see p. 372f.). It also bears a close relationship to the other two monologues of women, 4.3 and 4.7: as in 4.7 a dead woman proclaims her fidelity, and even more than 4.3 the woman of 4.11 presents herself as a model of wifely virtues. Thus the cycle of love poems of the book begins and ends with a piece celebrating conjugal love: one spoken by a young girl, one, in the solemn tone of funeral elegy, spoken by a mature woman and mother. There is also a formal relationship to 4.2: in 4.2 the statue of the god refers at the end to an epigram on its pedestal, suggesting that the whole speech formed an inscription on the statue (see above p. 366); 4.11 recalls the familiar type of monumental epigrams where a dead person is speaking from the tomb. However, as in 4.2, the epigrammatic conception is not maintained throughout the poem.¹⁹⁷

Cornelia begins by addressing her husband, but then continues by appealing to the powers of the underworld. From there she passes to an *apologia* before an imaginary court of the judges of the dead; but in this speech she includes a long passage where she again addresses her husband and now also her children, exhorting them to comfort one another after her death. This address is integrated into the speech as a kind of *peroratio* (in fact Cornelia uses the word *perorare* at the end of her speech in l. 99); as Camps rightly observes, in the *peroratio* it was customary for a defendant to invoke his or her dear ones in order to arouse sympathy.¹⁹⁸

The poem also shows a very neat and clear cut structure:¹⁹⁹ Cornelia's initial address to her husband comprises 14 ll., in which she solemnly proclaims the finality of death and the uselessness of tears and laments. As she had spoken extensively of the places of the underworld (a last example of *ekphrasis topou*, see above p. 375

¹⁹⁶ P. 216 in this volume.

¹⁹⁷ On the epigrammatic models cf. Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 70ff.; for the change of situation and address cf. Abel (1930) 104ff.

¹⁹⁸ For the rhetoric models and on *perorare* in particular, see Reinhard p. 216 in this volume; cf. also Day (1938) 74.

¹⁹⁹ Several transpositions of single couplets have been suggested which have some plausibility (especially those adopted by Goold in his edition, including his own to exchange 2f. with 6f.), but none is necessary.

with note 118), it comes naturally if she then addresses for further 14 ll. (15–28) the underworld itself and her dark powers, protesting that, despite her premature death, her life has been morally unobjectionable (15–18). Thus she sees herself before the court of the death (19–22), the paradigmatic sinners of the underworld, Sisyphus and Tantalus, and the monster Cerberus (23–26).

Imagining herself before this court, Cornelia delivers an apologia of her way of life (70 ll. 29–98, with two concluding couplets: 99–102). The speech begins with a first section of 28 ll. (29–56), in which Cornelia stresses, that, as a *univira* (35f.),²⁰⁰ she has led a life worthy of her distinguished ancestor. In 55f. she first addresses her mother; then, after a reference to the tears of her most distinguished relative, Augustus, at her funeral (57–60), she addresses her two sons (63f.) and her daughter (67f.). These addresses lead to the final part, modeled on the famous farewell speech of the Euripidean Alkestis (280ff.; cf. Reitzenstein 1969, 129ff.) and containing Cornelia's *mandata* to her family: in l. 73 she turns to her husband, and later in 87 to her sons, exhorting them to console each other. She will be content if her husband remains faithful to her memory, but, should he choose to remarry, her children should accept the new step-mother (85–90). Thus we find again, as in 4.7, the grand gesture of generous permissiveness of the mature woman and exemplary wife,²⁰¹ toward her companion.

Reitzenstein has rightly pointed out that in Cornelia's imagined defense *topoi* of both a *laudatio* and *consolatio* are mixed: almost like the Socrates of Plato's *Apology* she proudly points to her merits, which do not only guard her against any accusation, but rather deserve praise and reward. She consoles her family by depicting her life as one that has been fulfilled despite the fact that it may seem to have been cut short too early (with ll. 55ff. one may compare Laelius' words about Scipio's death in Cicero's *De amicitia* 3.11f.). In the two concluding couplets (99–102)²⁰² Cornelia sums up her proud claim to have lived worthy of her ancestors: *moribus et caelum patuit: sim digna merendo, / cuius honoratis ossa vehantur avis*²⁰³ 'To virtue heaven itself

²⁰⁰ Cf. Treggiani (1991) 233ff.

²⁰¹ See above, p. 381f.

²⁰² On the text and interpretation, cf. Reitzenstein (1969) 135; Reinhard p. 215f. in this volume.

²⁰³ For *avis* instead of the transmitted *avi*, see Reitzenstein (1970) *ad loc.*

has opened its gates: may my merits secure my shade conveyance to its illustrious ancestors'; words that resemble those of Horace in the *Roman Odes* (3.2.21f.): *virtus recludens immeritis mori caelum* 'virtue opens a way to heaven for those who deserve not to die'. But Cornelia, the woman, does not, of course, speak of *virtus*, but of *mores*, of 'civilized behavior', of *humanitas* in the full sense of the word. As a woman, she speaks exactly of the *mores*—the decline of which, according to Horace's last *Roman Ode* (3.6),²⁰⁴ mirrors Rome's political decline and misfortune, and which Augustus, in charge of the *cura morum et legum* (see Kienast 1992, 95), was so keen to restore in his attempt *paci imponere morem* 'to add civilization to peace'. And Horace in his praise of Augustus' achievements in peace, in *C.* 4.5 speaks exactly of that (*C.* 4.5.21ff.; cf. also *Epp.* 2.1.1f.).

Thus the Cornelia elegy is more than a worthy counterpart to the preceding poem on war heroes of the Roman past: Propertius puts the final claim of immortality gained by virtue in the mouth of a woman, asking for this reward for her private life, her commitment to conjugal love. He integrates the quest for virtue and its celebration into his poetry of love by transforming his concept of love. The unfulfilled aspiration of 'idealistic' love of elegiac poetry, the concept of love as a value that transcends death, has become reality in the claim for immortality of a woman worthy of its Roman ancestors. The deceased Cynthia of 4.7 too had reported to be the inhabitant of an Elysium of true lovers; but when she had to leave she went away among the shades, and her hopes for an afterlife together with her beloved were reduced to the confidence that her bones will rest beside his, while the virtuous wife Cornelia can be sure to earn immortality, to have her place in the Roman pantheon beside her ancestors. There could hardly be a more fitting conclusion to a book of national poetry by an elegiac poet.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁴ It is perhaps worth noting that *C.* 3.6 is followed by a poem (3.7) depicting a woman longing for her absent husband like Arethusa in 4.3.

²⁰⁵ 'Finally there is the noble elegy on the death of Cornelia, which for Roman dignity and grandeur has no peer outside the pages of Virgil, and is, perhaps, the most famous of all the poems of Propertius. It forms a worthy conclusion to a book that is predominantly Roman in spirit and maintains an extraordinarily high level of achievement', Butler-Barber (1933) p. xv.

PART SIX

THE RECEPTION OF PROPERTIUS' POETRY

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE RECEPTION OF PROPERTIUS IN LATE ANTIQUITY AND NEOLATIN AND RENAISSANCE LITERATURE

Simona Gavinelli

With the arrival of late antiquity, Propertius' success suffered a sharp decline. His refined love elegies probably did not meet with the poetic taste and the criteria of a political and civil society on its way toward disintegration. The only substantial enterprise of cultural rescue was attempted by Cassiodorus with the foundation of the renowned monastery of *Vivarium*, which took place soon after the year 540. But Propertius did not even appear in the ideal bibliographical canon laid out in the highly encyclopaedic formative project, set forth in his *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum* in which mostly grammarians, rhetoricians, and philosophers prevailed (Villa 1982, 293).

Even during the philological and antiquarian recovery of the classical tradition that took place all throughout the Carolingian revival, his literary production spread to a limited extent, and the very rare quotations all fall within the sphere of grammar transmission.¹ Under these circumstances it is understandable why he was excluded from a famous elenchus of rare authors, which is believed to be connected to the promoting circuits of the Frankish cultural politics. This elenchus, in which among the others appear Martial, Claudian, and the *Ars poetica* by Horace, and where elegiac poetry is represented only by Tibullus, was inserted in the miscellany Berlin, Staatsbibl., Diez B. Sant. 66, pp. 218–219, which was prepared in the eight to ninth century and, in different ways, connected to the court library of Charlemagne or with the Chapter Library in Verona where King Pipin resided (†810).²

The difficult circulation of the text during the high Middle Ages involved his exclusion from schooling programs, for example from the one established by the eminent Gerbert of Reims, who had been

¹ Tarrant (1983), 324; Butrica (1984), 19–21.

² Bischoff (1994) 68–73; Villa (1995) 300–301, 304–309, 313–314.

the preceptor to Otto III, later also Pope Sylvester II (998–1002). During his preceding teaching in Reims and thanks to his rhetorical education, he had recovered an articulation of a three-point scheme from Cicero's *De inventione* which, formalized in a precise literary canon of imitation, maintained itself stable until Dante's times. The formulation of this canon provided Virgil, Statius, and Lucan as models of excellent style; Persius, Juvenal and in particular Horace as models of style in satires; while for the comedy production only Terence was recommended.³ A similar tendency was maintained even in those cases in which, for educational necessities, the tripartition broadened to the point of including the elegy as a fourth poetic style, together with tragedy, satire, and comedy. Following this reasoning, an indication would be found in a thirteenth-century anonymous commentary regarding Cicero's *De inventione*, the manuscript Salamanca, Bibl. Univ., 87, f. 79r, in which the innovative quaternary system didn't seem to emphasize Propertius at all (Villa, 1992 a, 43, 46, 56). Another reason for his scanty educational use is due to the fact that he is practically absent from the surviving inventories of Middle Age libraries.⁴ The general overview of the situation seems to strengthen the interpretation of Ludwig Traube who, outlining the evolution of Latin poetry in a functional tripartite scheme, identified a Virgilian age, a Horatian age, and an Ovidian age, noticing moreover the smaller resonance of elegiac tradition.⁵

Propertius started spreading again gradually in northern France around the twelfth century, in a culturally strategic area where the precious monastic libraries of Corbie and St. Riquier were still active. The verbal revival of the Umbrian poet can be witnessed in *De septem septenis* and *Pamphilus* by John of Salisbury (†1180), who received his background education in France, between Chartres and Paris, in the same area where soon before the year 1200 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl., Gud. Lat., 224, the oldest manuscript and first example of a specific branch of the transmission revealed to be particularly correct was written.⁶ Approximately fifty years later, from an independent text, but probably belonging to a common archetype, the Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniv., Voss. Lat. O. 38 was transcribed

³ Villa (1992a) 43–45; Ead. (1992b) 24–25.

⁴ Munk Olsen 1985, 281–82.

⁵ Traube 1911, 23–24.

⁶ Butrica 1984, 23–24; Id. (in this volume).

near Orléans for Richard de Fournival, chancellor of the cathedral in Amiens. Propertius' consistent literary use is confirmed by the drafting of *Biblionomia*, a systematic bibliography composed by Richard de Fournival, in which knowledge is poetically divided in flowerbeds. After his death, some of the three hundred volumes that constituted his personal library, were passed into the hands of Gérard d'Abbeville, archdeacon of Amiens, who took them to Paris; there they were transferred in the Sorbonne library where Fournival's Propertius was still detectable in the catalogue drawn up in 1338.⁷

A textual reference, different from all the others, still leads back to northern France in the thirteenth century, as reported by the compiler of the florilegium Vat. Reg. Lat. 2120, before united with Par. Lat. 15155, and by the annotator of *Vocabularium* of Papia Bern, Burgerbibl., 276.⁸

Some traces of this tradition seem to have emerged precociously also in Northern Italy already in the second half of the thirteenth century. The rich repertoire of classical suggestions, taken from not very widely spread authors and exposed in the poems of the notary Lovato Lovati from Padua, excludes any dependence from *florilegia*. Similar considerations can also be put forward considering the Propertian quotations in the *Epistolae metricae* by the poet and dramatist Albertino Mussato, the other representative of Paduan prehumanism, active at the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁹

After the short Paduan interlude, the tradition of Propertius in Italy seemed to disappear until the revival carried out by Francesco Petrarch, whose intervention, as in many other Latin classics, constituted an effective connection between the transmission of tradition and the circles of the debuting humanism. In 1333, during his studying and researching sessions at the Sorbonne, he had the lucky experience of discovering Fournival's Propertius, the already mentioned Leiden, Voss. Lat. O. 38, which is at the present time mutilated and reduced to only two gatherings and can be reconstructed just through the successive apographs. After having submitted it to an intense philological analysis, hardly detectable on the margins and subsequently erased, he prepared his own personal copy.¹⁰ The unexpected

⁷ Ullman (1973) 41–53, 179; Rouse (1973) 253–69; Butrica (in this volume).

⁸ Butrica (1984) 25–30.

⁹ Billanovich (1958) 159–61, 169–70, 214–30.

¹⁰ Butrica (1984) 37–38, 237–38.

discovery of the elegiac poet didn't lead Petrarch to enclose him in the canon of his favorite books, laid out around the years 1337–1338 on the last flyleaf of Par. Lat. 2201.¹¹ A different literary perception of the Latin elegiac brought Petrarch to banish him from the group of classical authors systematically engaged to embed with marginal and interlinear notes his renowned Virgil, followed by his comment of Servius and illuminated by Simone Martini, now in Milan, Bibl. Ambr., A 79 inf.; to him he dedicated a prolonged philological and grammatical interest from 1338 until his death.¹² Nevertheless, the theory of a superficial and scanty fruition of Propertius by Petrarch seems to be nowadays completely discouraged. In his production in Latin and vernacular a deep influence from the Umbrian poet has been pointed out, scarcely based on direct quotations or on lexical recollections. In accord with his peculiar imitational canon that induced Petrarch to make stylistic originality prevail against the model, his elegiac inspiration is caught in the poetic formulation of the *Canzoniere* where, in the transposition of the vernacular language, he repropounded a peculiar artistic-biographic identity linked with a totalizing love experience, though interpreted in a Christian key. The lexical similarities are not few, like the repeated reference to the adjective 'molle' (soft), evocative of the Propertian style, or even more precise intertextual contacts embedded in Petrarchian production, especially in the *Secretum* and the *Triumphs*, where the couple "love and glory" is often mentioned, or the metaphor of diamond and love chains, as in Propertius 3.11.9, or the adamant hardness of Cynthia, superposed to Laura's strong spirit.¹³ The outspoken references to Propertius are in any case very rare, and they tend to place him within the category of love poets, as always beside the triad of Ovid, Catullus, and Tibullus. This is proved by the epistle sent in the years 1348–49 to an anonymous character, in the *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, composed in the years 1356–1357, and in the practically contemporary *Triumphus Cupidinis*, IV, 22–24, in which the mentioned poetic group appears among the men defeated by love. This detail is to be found again in the outlines, later refused, of the *Triumphus Fame*.¹⁴ In *Laura occidens*, 209–210, the tenth eclogue of

¹¹ Ullman (1973) 177–78, 192–95.

¹² Baglio (2004) 29–39; Petoletti (2004) 43–50.

¹³ Caputo (1998) 115–21.

¹⁴ Dolla (1987, 33–34.

Bucolicum Carmen, the reference to Propertius remains enigmatic and allegoric, but apart from clearing doubts about his Umbrian origin as opposed to a Roman origin, in that particular eclogue the intention is that of underlining, in a programmatic tone, his role of new creator of 'soft' love poetry.¹⁵

According to Giovanni Boccaccio, devout friend of the poet from Arezzo, the knowledge of Propertius does not seem to go beyond mentioning his name: together with Catullus and Ovid he is included in the *Genealogia deorum gentilium*, IV, 26, most probably derived from the quoted passage of Petrarch's *De remediis*.¹⁶ Another evidence of the scanty circulation of Propertius in Tuscany towards the end of the fourteenth century is offered by the *Fons memorabilium universi*, a colossal encyclopedia composed by the master Domenico Bandini from Arezzo, correspondent of Coluccio Salutati, who dedicated to Propertius only a brief biography in the alphabetical review of eminent men, built on the basis of Ovid, *Tristia*, 4, 10, 45, and on the short reference to the tenth eclogue by Petrarch.¹⁷

After Petrarch's death, the Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati, due to his great poetic interests, was induced to ask the common friend Lombardo della Seta to send him a specimen of the production of the uncommon Latin elegiac poet. This operation was accomplished in Padua around the year 1380, working directly on the original Petrarchian manuscript, with the copy of Florence, Bibl. Laur., XXXVI 49; in this text the versions and the notes by Petrarch are combined with marginal notes by Lombardo della Seta, later enriched by Salutati's ones.¹⁸ Petrarch's copy, before being lost like most of his library, generated further models, as demonstrated by the direct textual relationship of the final section of Propertius with the later manuscript of Venice, Bibl. Marciana, Z 443 (1912), prepared in Padua as well in the year 1453 by Giovanni Marcanova.¹⁹

Petrarch's anti-pedagogical attitude was expressed in the renowned *Familiare* 12, 3, sent to the friend and schoolteacher Zanobi da Strada, in which he reprehended vividly those who, giving up real glory, spent their time educating the young. During the whole first part of the fifteenth century, this attitude contributed to perpetrate the

¹⁵ Martellotti (1983) 388–95; Caputo (1998) 116, 121–22.

¹⁶ Dolla (1987) 30.

¹⁷ Hankey (1957) 187; Giazzi (2004) 123.

¹⁸ Ullman (1973) 177–79; Rizzo (1991) 16–19; Butrica (in this volume).

¹⁹ Butrica (1984) 40, 51, 96; Id. (in this volume).

exclusion of the Latin poet from the school syllabi, which remained conservative and closed around the models of Cicero and Virgil.²⁰ Still in 1455 Poggio Bracciolini, reacting towards Alamanno Rinuccini, who wanted to ensure the Studio in Florence with eminent masters, proposed as models humanists who such as Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, Carlo Marsuppini, Ambrogio Traversari, Roberto Rossi, Niccolò Niccoli and Giannozzo Manetti, were self-taught men following Petrarch's example and who had, as a consequence, exercised themselves in the reading of the authors, avoiding the superfluous mediation of teachers.²¹ However, the promoters of Humanism, disregarding Petrarch's initial point of view, focused more and more on the education and the schooling formation of the young, both in its private sphere as court tutors as in public schools. Therefore, they carried out a project already suggested by eminent masters, including Guarino da Verona and Vittorino da Feltre, who both had often dedicated themselves to pedagogical treatise writing. In a society, which was hardly flexible and highly hierarchic, the Humanists gradually obtained the monopoly of education. This incredible success later motivated them to extend the rhetorical principles of imitation and emulation to behavioral schemes of everyday life so that they ended up influencing the aesthetic canon of clothing, entertainment, and the convivial 'politesse' of courtly life and of the emerging mercantile middle class.

The spread of erotic poets in school syllabi was lessened by moralistic and pedagogical concerns. Accordingly, around the year 1436 Ugolino Pisani dissuaded teachers from engaging themselves in public lectures about authors like Propertius, Catullus, Tibullus, Juvenal, Persius, Martial, and Ovid's *Ars Amandi*, *Remedia amoris*, and finally *Priapeia*; he suggested instead that they should assign this reading not to a public use but to a domestic environment.²² The demands of the humanist pedagogical precepts also lead Rinuccini, supporter of a strict and moralizing education, to censure with sternness the soft and lascivious verses of Propertius, Catullus, Tibullus, and Ovid, an opinion also shared by Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the future Pope Pius II (1458–1464) who, in his *Tractatus de liberorum educatione*, condemned Propertius' and the other poets' exaggerated lewdness, advising the young to postpone this reading to a more mature age.²³

²⁰ Garin (1958) 22–31; Rizzo (2002) 145.

²¹ Rizzo (2002) 147.

²² Rizzo (2002) 162.

²³ Rinuccini (1953) 92–93 n° 31; Garin (1958) 268.

The conformist adherence to these conditions would justify the exclusion of these texts from the library left in heritage to his hometown by Sozomeno from Pistoia, a pioneer of discoveries about new Latin authors (Savino (1976) 163). A slightly more moderate and open opinion is held by the Franciscan Antonio da Rho, Gasparino Barzizza's disciple and successor on the Milanese chair of eloquence in 1421 where he taught Pier Candido and Angelo Decembrio. The opponent of Lorenzo Valla, accused of plagiarism in the second volume of the *Elegantie* and in the *Raudensiane note*, only mentioned Propertius, inserted in his *Apologia* composed before 1430, within a rich literary canon of Latin authors not even strictly Ciceronian.²⁴ It belongs to the same context when Angelo Decembrio includes the elenchus of *Tristia* 4, 10, 45, where Propertius is mentioned among the Latin elegiac poets, in his *De politia litteraria*, 1, 3, 28, written after 1447 at the court of the ducal family of Este in Ferrara, where the elegiac poet had already been circulating for some decades.²⁵

In the first half of the fifteenth century the diffusion of the Propertian text in the plain of Lombardy between Milan and Pavia was inconsistent, and the only valuable reference is constituted by Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Holkham misc. 36, probably transcribed in Genoa in 1421 by Giovanni Campofregoso with a direct connection to Petrarch's copy, just like Par. Lat. 7989, written in Florence in autumn of 1423, in which Propertius appears with Tibullus, Catullus, and the *Cena Trimalchionis* by Petronius, discovered in the same year in Colonia by Poggio Bracciolini.²⁶ Thanks to his commitment in the interception and the transcription of texts of rare or unknown authors, the city of Florence came to represent an authentic center for the spread of the classics. Bracciolini, with incredible timeliness, between 1400 and 1405, had made it his duty to create a copy from Salutati's Propertius for Niccolò Niccoli in Florence, Bibl. Laur. San Marco, 690, ff. 1r–80v, subsequently erased and rewritten with Greek patristic texts.²⁷ Having moved to Rome in the late spring of 1427, he managed to send to Florence another specimen of the Latin author, bearer of another branch of the tradition, more correct than the one known through Petrarch but still coming from Northern France. The text is close to the more ancient Wolfenbüttel, Gud. Lat. 224, but

²⁴ Regoliosi (1993) 1–35; Giazzi (2003) 155–81.

²⁵ Angelo Camillo Decembrio (2002) 158–59.

²⁶ Butrica (1984) 37–40, 54–58, 96, 276–79; id. (in this volume).

²⁷ Butrica (1984) 54f., 226.

without further evidence we cannot know whether Bracciolini, during his transalpine missions, had brought to Italy the same Wolfenbüttel, Gud. Lat. 224, or rather a similar text.²⁸ While living in Florence in 1427, also Antonio Beccadelli, known as the Panormita, in the Vat. Lat. 3273 created a typical and elegant humanist copy of a classical author in manual format, following a book and textual model which contributed to ensure channels of distribution in culturally more advanced Italian centres.²⁹

Always in Florence, because of the similarity of the genre and in the wake of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, the reception of Propertius is visible in the inspiration of the elegiac poetry of the XVth century, intended for courtly entertainment. It seems evident in the poetic conception of the *Xandra*, composed by Cristoforo Landino in 1446 with an additional aim, shared by Leon Battista Alberti. As a matter of fact, like Propertius had imported in Rome the Greek elegy of Callimachus, they wanted to take advantage of the analogy between Propertius and Petrarch in order to legitimize the poetic use of Italian vernacular.³⁰ A devout supporter of Landino was the younger Florentine poet Naldo Naldi, who, in his elegies completed between 1462–1463 but spread only ten years later, demonstrated his debt towards the Propertian and Petrarchian tradition (Martelli (1985) 324; Tateo (1987) 63–64). In Florence, during the last period of the fifteenth century, many Propertian influences can be detected in the *Amores* of Alessandro Braccesi in which, similarly to Giovanni Pontano's style, the bawdy passion blends with the theme of marital fidelity.³¹ The peak of Propertius's literary success in Tuscany was attained through Angelo Poliziano, who, in the *Elegie*, in the *Epigrammi* and the *Stanze*, managed to skillfully merge themes and lexical patterns. Presenting himself as the imitator of Propertius, and, as a consequence, of Callimachus, and reflecting on his unique perception of the Latin-Greek poetics, in the *Nutricia*, 539–542 he declared his unconditional preference toward Propertius rather than Tibullus, who had been held in great esteem by Quintilian in the field of rhetoric, *inst.* 10.1.93, who praised his simple stylistic elegance.³²

²⁸ Butrica, 1984, 40–41, 62–68, 323–25.

²⁹ Butrica (1984) 65–67, 312–13; Id. (in this volume).

³⁰ La Penna (1977) 269–71; Tateo (1987) 50–52; Santoro (1987) 73–76, 78–80.

³¹ Tateo (1987) 61–62; Santoro (1987) 80–82.

³² Godman (1998) 70–71, 91–92; Tateo (1998) 153–67.

In tracing down the geographical areas of the humanistic reception of Propertius, another pole of attraction for his works appears to be the court of the Este, dominated by Guarino da Verona's eminent figure after its transfer to Ferrara in 1429. Some years before, when he was still in Verona, in a letter sent to Florence in 1426 to the friend Mariotto Nori, he requested a copy of Propertius.³³ The introduction of the Latin poet to this court seems to be due to the bibliophile Giovanni Aurispa. The latter, in a letter written in 1427, soon before moving to Ferrara as lecturer, where he remained till his death in 1459, rejoiced in obtaining from Florence, presumably from his friend Antonio Beccadelli (Panormita) a particularly correct Propertian codex.³⁴ Probably influenced by Guarino's opinions and by the progressive preparation of new manuscripts which supported the growing interest for elegiac poetry, the lyrical production of the poets from Ferrara, committed to love themes, were deeply affected by Propertius. Chronologically, it was the *Eroticon libri sex* by Guarino's student Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, that imposed itself at first. Even though stylistically he seems to be closer to Catullus and Tibullus, he also shows some subtle Propertian characteristics that perhaps stimulated him in 1443 to create, probably himself, a copy of Propertius in Florence, Bibl. Naz. Centrale, Magliabechi, VII 1053.³⁵ Similar inclinations can be detected in the contemporary Basinio da Parma, himself a student of Guarino, who, although with scanty lexical revival, recreated some Propertian themes, like that of eternalizing the beloved woman in his poetry and the uniqueness of love in his collection of elegies *Cyris*, composed in the fourth decade of the fifteenth century and subsequently in the *Isotteo* written at the court of Rimini.³⁶ In this particularly fruitful setting for his poetic assimilation, the creation of the elegiac miscellany Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl., Helmst., 338 seems indicative. It was transcribed in 1461 by the notary and poet from Ferrara Giovanni da Carpi, in which Propertius alone represents the elegiac poets coupled with contemporary poets only, an expression of the Ferrara poetics by Guarino Veronese and Tito Vespasiano Strozzi.³⁷ The devotion of the Strozzi family regarding Propertius, was alive until Ercole's times,

³³ Butrica (1984) 120, 130; Tateo (1987) 52–53.

³⁴ Franceschini (1976) 86–87; Butrica (1984) 132–35.

³⁵ Butrica (1984) 100–10, 227; Tateo (1987) 41–49, 52.

³⁶ Tateo (1987) 49–50.

³⁷ Butrica (1984) 146–48, 325–29; De Robertis (1985) 257–58.

Tito Vespasiano's son, in whose rather pathetic and tiresome elegiac production Propertius is qualified as "tender".³⁸

Also in Siena, around the third decade of the fifteenth century, an early manifestation of Propertian promotion took place in the *Angelinetum* by Giovanni Marrasio. Brought up with his teaching are both the debuting Enea Silvio Piccolomini and Giovannantonio Campano. Piccolomini, with his *Cinthia*, wanted to demonstrate his dedication to the Latin model especially in the choice of the name of the main character of the love story. Campano, thanks to his *Elegiae*, entered directly in the entourage of the future Pope after his successive clerical conversion.³⁹

The introduction and the circulation of Propertius in the Aragon court in Naples seems to be due to Pontano, who was engaged in a diplomatic mission in Ferrara in 1450 with Panormita. This process was also attained thanks to the so-called *codex Tomacellianus*, named after its owner Marino Tomacelli, friend of the latter, and written by his brother Leo Tomacelli, who took Panormita's copy as a model (Butrica (1984) 107). Quite similarly to the lascivious and antiheroic features of the poet, with whom he shared Umbria as his native region, it was especially Pontano, who in writing his *Amores* and *Parthenopeus*, intended to recreate more soberly the daring experimentation of Panormita. The latter, as a matter of fact, in his *Hermaphroditus*, although he mentioned Propertius, had reduced the tone of his elegy, preferring instead the comic and epigrammatic characteristics of Catullus and Martial. But Pontano, apart from adhering more closely to Propertius, in order to attain a certain poetic homogeneity, also added some features belonging from the contemporary Ferrara poets such as Tito Vespasiano Strozzi and Basinio da Parma, all recognizable in the *Elegie* by Jacopo Sannazzaro, before his epic turning point with *De partu Virginis*.⁴⁰ Pontano's interest for Propertius shows itself not only in his poetry but also in his *Dialogi* in prose. Propertius is present from his *Antonius*, until the creation of the linguistic theories in the *De aspiratione*.⁴¹ The strong attraction that Propertius' poetry exerted on him from a stylistic and

³⁸ Rati (1987) 117–21.

³⁹ La Penna (1977) 264–66; Coppini (1981) 171–73; Paparelli (1987) 66–70; Tateo (1998) 125–40.

⁴⁰ Coppini (1981) 172–73; Tateo (1987) 53–60; id. (1998) 126.

⁴¹ Pontano (1943) 82; Germano (1985) 6, 37, 74, 106.

antiquary point of view made him transcribe the text in 1460 in the Berlin, Staatsbibl., Lat. fol. 500, and he also added some marginal notes, textually correlated with the *Tomacellianus*. For the same reason he also obtained some other Propertian manuscripts prepared in Florence between 1460 and 1470, such as the Genève-Cologny, Bibl. Bodmeriana, cod. Bod. Lat. 141 and the München, Universitätsbibl., Cim. 22 where his marginal notes and philological corrections are observable.⁴²

In the cultural revival of the mid fifteenth century in Italy an important role was played by Lorenzo Valla. The *Elegantiae*, dedicated to Giovanni Tortelli, constitute an authentic manifesto to set out rules for a new conception of linguistic competence in Latin, considered an instrument for knowledge and civilization. The objective was to propose an imitational manual of rhetoric in which the most renowned authors would be inserted in order to refine the use of Latin, with the intention of free prose style from its Ciceronian orientation; thus it anticipates a tendency, which would later become the learned and expressive eclecticism of Angelo Poliziano.⁴³ While Valla was working on his major works, he explicitly listed his favorite sources in a letter sent to Giovanni Serra in 1440. There Propertius appears together with other elegiac poets he did not include in his stylistic-grammatical disapproval.⁴⁴ Apart from this declaration Valla's vast production does not show any particular fondness for the Latin poet. This attitude probably influenced the linguistic-grammatical works flourishing under the patronage of the Holy See of Rome during the papacy of Niccolò V (1447–1455), where Valla spent the last decade of his life, from 1448 to 1457. The absence of Propertius is conspicuous both in the *De ortographia* of his friend Tortelli and also in the representatives of the more grammatical trend such as Bartolomeo Sulmonese, Gian Giacomo Boccabella, Pietro Odo di Montopoli, and Pomponio Leto.⁴⁵ Pietro Odo di Montopoli, poet and friend of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, was also involved by Niccolò V in the selection of the manuscripts intended for the creation of the Vatican Library in which Propertius had not been included. His interest for the Latin poet expressed itself in his philological and

⁴² Ullman (1973) 491; Butrica (1984) 67–95, 107–10, 209–10, 215–16, 266–67; Monti Sabia (1996) 180, 183–84; Butrica (in this volume).

⁴³ Rizzo (1986) 386–87.

⁴⁴ Besomi/Regoliosi (1984) 197.

⁴⁵ Besomi (1970) 95–137; Bianchi-Rizzo (2000) 587–653; Donati (2000) 68–70.

exegetic annotations on the margins of Vat. Lat. 1595, containing the works by Ovid and originally ordered for the same Vatican Library.⁴⁶ It is then understandable how Pomponio Leto, his student and founder of the Roman Academy, made it his duty to prepare for his own student Fabio Mazzatosta in the Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 15, a copy in which Propertius appears together with Catullus and Tibullus; the ms. descends directly from the specimen by Poggio Bracciolini.⁴⁷

More or less in the same period the cardinal Niccolò Cusano, discoverer of codices and friend of Niccolò V, shows some interest for Propertius. On his command, Mariano de *Magistris de Urbe*, who pursued an ideal study project based on specific textual and philological traditions, copied between 1461 and 1465 the Leningrad, Bibl. Saltykov-Shchedrin, Cl. Lat. Q 12: there the *Elegantiae* and the *Raudentianae notae* by Lorenzo Valla were united with the elegiac poets Catullus and Tibullus. It is interesting that on f. 76v we read the *Life* of the Umbrian poet by Antonio Volsco which, in more erudite circles, was bound to oust the one included by Sicco Polenton in his *Scriptorum illustrium linguae libri XVIII*.⁴⁸

Thanks to the frequent contacts among the humanists in the mid fifteenth century, Propertius spread with growing approval even in northern Italy, where he found the interest renowned bibliophile representatives of the church and even influenced the poetic orientation of the courts.

The admirers of Valla and of his innovative program included also the high Friulan prelate Guarnerio D'Artegna. His tight connections with the Venetian humanism, represented by Francesco Barbaro, but especially the friendship with Poggio Bracciolini and his exquisite book competence, motivated him to look for a manuscript of Propertius. The copy in his outstanding library was later donated to his city: San Daniele in Friuli, Bibl. Civica Guarneriana, 56 is the result of thorough research, written by the trusted scribe Battista da Cingoli in 1452 and textually akin to the common Paduan tradition.⁴⁹

In the court of Milan Propertius, like other elegiac poets, was imitated by Francesco Filelfo, who adopted vaguely Propertian tones in

⁴⁶ Donati (2000) 94, 148, 150–51.

⁴⁷ Butrica (1984) 67–68, 291–92; Maddalo (1991) 49, 61–62; Butrica (in this volume).

⁴⁸ Ullman (1928) 63–64; Bianca (1983) 555, 579–82.

⁴⁹ Butrica (1984) 138–40, 296; Casarsa-D'Angelo-Scalon (1991) 97, 262–63, 486.

his lyrics dedicated to the courtly love scenery, especially in his epithalamium or when he, as in the fourth book of the *Sphortias*, spoke of the unfortunate loves of some of the members of the powerful dynasty of the Sforza family.⁵⁰

Propertius' massive success was also boosted by the arrival of printing. In 1472 two Venetian editions of the *Elegie* were published: the first is without indication of the printer; the second where Propertius is mingled with Catullus, Tibullus, and Statius, can be attributed to the workshop of Vindelino da Spira.⁵¹ The competition of the typographic workshops set off the quick and symptomatic reaction of the copyist corporation which, in the same year, for example in Genoa, had asked the competent city authorities to forbid the reproduction of books, not only liturgical ones but also the ones containing Latin authors, including Propertius.⁵²

Once the spur of the first humanism, which had concentrated on the recovery of classics and their intrinsic educational value, died down, in the last quarter of the century the interests of humanists concentrated more on the interpretation of texts: authors were chosen who, through their complexity, were suited to show scholarly competence. At the same time, the space dedicated to exegesis was enlarged; thus the commentary was adapted to receive the erudite digressions of a generation of humanists who intended to consolidate its professional prestige by creating editions of classics adorned with more and more encyclopaedic and autonomous commentaries. Propertius was one of the first authors who entered the new literary canon, and with his editorial story he outlines a paradigmatic path that allows following the stages of the new exegetic approach. The pioneering merit is due to Domizio Calderini from Verona, who, in 1475 in Rome, published a separate comment on the text, following the model of the students' *recollectae*, even though limited to some anthological passages, which he considered more complex. With a more coherent and vast comment he then furnished the later edition of Brescia in 1486, in which Catullus and Tibullus were also included, entrusted to the efforts of Antonio Partenio and Bernardino Cillenio respectively.⁵³ In the great season dedicated to

⁵⁰ Albanese (1986) 435–37.

⁵¹ Butrica (1984) 159–60; Fedeli (in this volume).

⁵² Rozzo (2001) 194.

⁵³ Coppini (1996) 29–31.

the commentaries on classics, characterized by hard critics and ferocious controversies among intellectuals, the commentary by Calderini about Propertius, although streamlined by Poliziano, was necessarily accepted by successors.⁵⁴ In the exegetic apparatus prepared by Filippo Beroaldo for the Bologna edition of 1487, and in the following year by Antonio Volsco, it seems very evident how the philologists at the end of the century had improved their philological comments and criticism, also by supporting it, in many cases, with a reference to more ancient codices.⁵⁵ With this continuous effort, commentaries started becoming a work of their own, basically separated from the didactic circuit and directed more specifically to a selected public of experts in the field. In this context, a new conception of the role of the commentator was established and reevaluated: the hermeneutic procedure overcame the authentic poetic creativity. The turning point, already introduced by Calderini in his commentary about Statius, radicalized itself in the dedicatory premise of Beroaldo's commentary about Propertius. Manipulating Cicero's lessons in the *De divinatione*, 1, 34, the role of grammarians, defined as 'rhapsodists' in the *Ion* by Plato, was exposed to a sort of sacred exaltation: a kind of poetic fury enabled them to paraphrase the more complicated passages.⁵⁶

The more scientific and erudite tendency of fifteenth-century philology reached its peak with the publication in 1489 of the first *Centuria* by Poliziano. In one of his notes in his own hand at the end of the *Elegie* by Propertius, contained in the first Venetian edition of 1472, now Rome, Bibl. Corsiniana, Inc. 50 F 37, f. 127v, Poliziano reveals that this author was familiar to him since his childhood, together with the other elegiac poets such as Tibullus and Catullus. The poet had been in fact the object of a careful collation, of which a note had been jotted down in a lost *Liber antiquarum emendationum*; it had been prepared using an ancient codex, which in his *Miscellanea* Poliziano claims to have found in Rome in 1484 in the house of the Roman noble man Berardino Valla.⁵⁷ It can be supposed that this ancient manuscript could be the one mentioned by Poggio Bracciolini Wolfenbüttel, Gud. 224, taken to Rome by Berardino

⁵⁴ Fedeli (in this volume).

⁵⁵ Coppini (1996) 31; Bise Casella (1996) 135–51; Pezzarossa (2000) 313, 315, 327, 336, 343; Fedeli (in this volume).

⁵⁶ Coppini (1996) 31–32, 37–38.

⁵⁷ Maier (1965) 1, 319, 361–62; Butrica (1984) 80.

Valla through his contacts in Florence, and subsequently taken to Naples (whence it derives the name *Neapolitanus* in critical editions) in 1502. There it probably was collated by Francesco Pucci (as indicated by an annotation, maybe in his own hand, inserted on his personal Florence edition, Bibl. Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372, printed in Reggio Emilia in 1481); then it came to the library of the community of San Giovanni in Carbonara, where it was later used by the Dutch scholar Nicolaas Heinsius (1620–1681).⁵⁸ The readings mentioned by Francesco Pucci share the same source, which left its traces also in northern Italy. Another hypothesis suspects that the Wolfenbüttel, Gud. 224, or a humanistic apograph, did travel to the Milan area, where in the decade between 1470 and 1480, between Milan and Pavia, three very similar copies were written: Ambr. I 67 sup., and Grenoble, Bibl. de la Ville, 549 and the Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibl., Dc. 133.⁵⁹ In this rather obscure process even the Calabrian humanist Aulo Giano Parrasio was probably involved. He was living in the area at this time before moving to Naples, where he was friendly with Pontano and owned a Propertian codex.⁶⁰

Gradually substituting the manuscript tradition, the printing industry increased considerably the spread of Propertius and of his commentaries among the great public of scholars and students. Among them the presence of the Florentine Pier Vettori, friend of Poliziano and master of Francesco Pucci, is often noted. Although he never produced commented editions of the poet, his precious library, according to the eighteenth-century inventory München, Bayerische Staatsbibl., Clm C 209 a contained two Propertian editions: the 1481 one, in which the notes of Francesco Pucci appear, and the printed copy of 1502 of Aldo Manuzio.⁶¹

Moreover, gleaning in some libraries of late fifteenth century humanists who, in different roles, happened to have contacts with the court of Milan, Propertius' success becomes evident. Manuscripts of Propertius are mentioned in the inventory of 1488 of the Greek and Latin books belonging to Bartolomeo Petroni, tutor of the future Duke Ludovico il Moro. Here Propertius is inserted together with

⁵⁸ Richardson (1976) 278–79; Butrica (1984) 65, 80–81; Id. (in this volume).

⁵⁹ Butrica (1984) 63–65, 145–48, 217–18, 233–34, 261–62.

⁶⁰ Butrica (1984) 63–64; Germano (1985) 7, 106; Tristano (1988) 27 n. 89, 109; Butrica (in this volume).

⁶¹ Griffante (1988–1989) 372, 398 n° 151, 417 n° 317.

Tibullus, Catullus, and the *Silvae* by Statius in a codex without binding.⁶² Entertainment was very important in the atmosphere of Ludovico il Moro's court. In this respect the interest for Latin classical poetry, including Propertius and the other elegiac poets and Martial, was reinvigorated by the poet Gaspare Visconti. The entire group of poets is present in the inventory of books in his property listed after his death in December 1500.⁶³ A similar documentation is also available in the library of the Venetian poet Galeazzo Facino, friend and correspondent of Ermolao Barbaro, who was attracted by the brilliance of the Sforza court, where he was involved in a controversy between Giorgio Merula and Poliziano. Propertius is in fact inserted in a printed and bound text in the inventory of his library of 1506.⁶⁴ The edition of the *Carmina* by Propertius, Tibullus, Catullus, and Statius, printed in Milan in 1475, can be recognized among about one hundred books, classics in particular, bequeathed to the Franciscan convent S. Francesco in Milan by Giulio Emilio Ferrari (1452–1529). The latter was a public rhetoric lecturer in the Academy founded in Milan by Ludovico il Moro and he was also a contributor to the editorial initiatives of Ulrich Scinzenzeler.⁶⁵

In the wide knowledge of the Latin poet in the fifteenth century, his role in shaping the learned literary production of many Renaissance authors has shown his presence even in unexpected circles. Some references can be traced in the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, composed by the Venetian Dominican Francesco Colonna, friend of Aldo Manuzio, a work remarkable for its refined mixture of Latin and vernacular.⁶⁶ More surprising still is his presence in the sources of a sermon in vernacular by the same author.⁶⁷

Here the success of the poet is connected to representatives of religious Orders. A contribution to Propertian philology is offered by another Dominican friar: Annio da Viterbo. The latter, who returned to his native city in 1489, after having resided in Genoa for twenty years, dedicated himself wholeheartedly to the study of Greek and Latin classical authors for antiquarian purposes, as can

⁶² Ganda (1993), 86, 89.

⁶³ Pedralli (2002) 158, 609–10.

⁶⁴ Gargan (1983), 277, 291, n° 103.

⁶⁵ Pedralli (2002), 413–14, 423, 590–91.

⁶⁶ Francesco Colonna (1980) 132, 172, 179, 185, 213, 230, 262, 279, 284, 313, 376, 394, 420, 438.

⁶⁷ Casella-Pozzi (1984) 159–80.

be seen in his *Commentaria super opera diversorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium*. In a short period of time he recovered a huge amount of information and also created false epigraphs and texts. He even ventured to propose an emendation of the text at 4.2.51, substituting *Lycomedius* with *Lucumonius*, a reading accepted in the Parisian edition of 1577 by Joseph Justus Scaliger and by Karl Lachmann in 1816.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Fumagalli (1984) 337–38.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

THE RECEPTION OF PROPERTIUS IN THE MODERN AGE: JOHANN WOLFGANG VON GOETHE'S *RÖMISCHE ELEGIEN* AND EZRA POUND'S *HOMAGE TO SEXTUS PROPERTIUS*

Bernhard Zimmermann

(Translated by Jonas Grethlein, Freiburg)

I¹

The reception of ancient authors can take different paths: sometimes, it is *one* extraordinary work that fascinates and continues to spark new discussions; in other cases, it is the whole oeuvre of an author that impresses the readers. Yet, due to particular “coordinating points” in the reception, it is often the person of the author that is adorned with an aura. Anecdotes frequently lead to a reception that focuses more on the person than on the work of the author. As a consequence, the literary work tends to be read against the background of the anecdotic tradition dealing with the poet’s life. Two examples for such “coordinating points”: Aristophanes *Frogs* (405 BC) strongly influenced the understanding of Aeschylus and Euripides in the following centuries,² and the Pindar-ode by Horace (*C.* 4.2) made the Greek poet a genius beyond poetic rules.³

Where the complete works or a single text by an author is referred to, the function of this reference may vary—it can be affirmative,

¹ *HA* (Hamburger Ausgabe) = *Goethes Werke. Textkritisch durchgesehen und kommentiert von E. Trunz*, 14 Bde. (München 161996); *FA* (Frankfurter Ausgabe) = *Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Sämtliche Gedichte, Bd. 1. Herausgegeben von K. Eibl* (Frankfurt/M. 1987); *WA* (Weimarer Ausgabe) = *Goethes Werke. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Großherzogin Sophie von Sachsen* (Weimar 1887–1919; Nachdruck: München 1987); cf. also *Goethes Briefe und Briefe an Goethe. Hamburger Ausgabe in 6 Bänden*. Herausgegeben von K. R. Mandelkow (München 31988); F. Schiller, *Sämtliche Werke, Bd. V: Philosophische Schriften, Vermischte Schriften* (München 1968); E. Pound, *Homage to Sextus Propertius. A New Text with Sexti Propertii Carmina Selecta recensuit Lucianus Mueller*, in: J. P. Sullivan, *Ezra Pound and Sextus Propertius. A Study in Creative Translation* (Austin 1964).

² Cf. Snell (1975) 111–126; Zimmermann (2001).

³ Cf. Schmidt (1985) 254–269 on Goethe’s Prometheus-poem.

subversive, parodist, imitative etc., but the point of reference is clear. However, when an author adopts the style of a genre or an epoch, referring not to a particular author, but to a group of authors, things become more complex.⁴ In these cases, the methods of „Quellenforschung“ are bound to fail. Collecting *loci similes* from “praetexts” makes but little sense where an author has composed a text in accordance with the style, the imagery, and the norms of a whole genre or, to go further, merely with view to the contemporary understanding of a genre.^{5,6}

Elegy as a genre is the point of reference for neo-Latin poetry: Peter Luder (1410–after 1474), Johannes Camerarius (1500–1574), Johannes Secundus (1511–1536) and Petrus Lotichius Secundus (1528–1560), who imitated among others Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. It is not always possible to figure out the particular texts to which these poets refer, as they draw on motives, reminiscences, and reflections that lead the reader to elegy as a genre.⁷ Moreover, the boundaries of genres can be blurred: Tibullus (1.1 and 1.10) and Propertius (2.19) serve besides Virgil’s eclogues and Horace’s second epode as models for bucolic and pastoral poetry in the seventeenth century.⁸ Elegiac elements, the joy of love and mourning as in Ovid and Propertius, are at the core of many poems by Christian Günther (1695–1723). As he was often classified as „Erlebnisdichter“ who reflected on his experiences in his poetry, even in the twentieth century, scholarship failed to detect that Günther’s poetry strongly draws on topoi of Roman elegy. As in scholarly works on the Roman elegiac poets, no distinction was made between poet and elegiac I.

⁴ On the problems that arise for the theory of intertextuality, see Zimmermann (2001). According to Genette, we would have to use the term “architextuality” to signify references at the level of genre. Cf. the comments by Conte/Barchiesi (1989) 94f.: “Spesso il fine dei poeti antichi è di rifare e sostituire un modello piuttosto che di ricordarlo. Per questo occorre che il modello sia trattato non come un esemplare ma come una sorta di matrice generativa: un modello di competenza che potremmo chiamare Modello-Genere. «Scrivere alla maniera di» significa generalizzare: ciò che veramente si imita sono stili, convenzioni, norme, generi. /.../ ora il modello non è più un testo, una totalità concreta, ma un insieme di tratti distintivi, una struttura generativa.”

⁵ The encyclopaedic works are an important source for the mentality of the time.

⁶ However, it is wrong to employ the category of pastiche; cf. Karrer (1977) 47–50.

⁷ Cf. Baier (2001) 108f.

⁸ Cf. Riedel (2000) 81.

II

Elegy had been an established genre since the fifteenth century. However, attempts to use the elegiac distich in German poetry were not made until 1750. It was Klopstock who introduced the dactylic hexametre and the elegiac distich. Then, the translation of Homer by Voss (*Odyssey*, 1781; *Iliad*, 1793) and his translation of Virgil's *Georgica*, the introduction to which contained a critical discussion of Klopstock's metres, provoked a first debate. First, Goethe eagerly followed it and discussed with A. W. Schlegel his own hexametrical poetry in 1796. Later however, he grew disappointed by the philological pedantry and turned away from ancient metrical forms.⁹

The practical interest in Roman elegy led to theoretical reflections on the genre, as in Johann Georg Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste* (1771/1774)—a book often consulted by Goethe—and Friedrich Schiller's *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (published in 1795 like Goethe's *Römische Elegien*). Sulzer (vol. 1, 310f.) follows the ancient pseudo-etymology that traces the name "elegy" back to *elegen*, "lamenting", but takes into account that the genre is not limited to sorrowful accounts, seeing that it was open to a great variety of contents:¹⁰ „Klagen über den Verlust einer geliebten Person; über Untreu eines Freundes; über Ungerechtigkeit und Unterdrückung; über hartes Schicksal; Vergnügen über zärtliche Aussöhnung, über ein wieder erlangtes Gut; Aeusserungen der Dankbarkeit, der Andacht, und jedes andern zärtlich vergnügten Affekts.“ Schiller's reflections on elegy's polymorphism in his *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* are similar. He argues that the various contents are due to the poets' different attitudes to nature and ideals. He expands the formal definition of genre to a dominating „Empfindungsweise“ in poetry. Thus, the "elegiac" is not restricted to elegies, but can be also found in other genres like drama or the epic.¹¹

⁹ See his comment in a letter to Zelter, 22.6.1808 (*HA Briefe*, vol. 3, 75, l.18): „Für lauter Prosodie ist ihm die Poesie ganz verschwunden.“

¹⁰ „Elegie. / . . . / Bedeutet eigentlich ein *Klagelied*, welchen Namen man dieser Art des Gedichtes geben könnte, wenn nicht auch bisweilen vergnügte Empfindungen der Inhalt der Elegie wären. Der wahre Charakter derselben scheint darin zu bestehen, daß der Dichter von einem sanften Affekt der Traurigkeit oder einer sanften mit viel Zärtlichkeit vermischten Freude ganz eingenommen ist, und sie auf eine einnehmende etwas schwatzhafte Art äussert.“

¹¹ „Daß ich die Benennung Satire, Elegie und Idylle in einem weiteren Sinne

His trip to Italy (1786–1788) prompted Goethe to use the elegiac meter. The free rhythmic forms of his early poetry, which were modeled after Pindar, are replaced by the rigid distichs, which are not only defined with respect to the number of syllables, *caesurae* and *dihaereseis*, but are also fixed modules, as sometimes the hexameter through catalexis and always the end of the pentameter request a pause. Other than in poems with free rhythms, the content, even or particularly when emotions are concerned, has to follow the form. After a long controversy, the view has been established that the *Römische Elegien*¹² do not contain any original Roman elements and hence were not written while Goethe was in Rome, but only after his return to Weimar „in der ersten Zeit des Liebesglücks mit Christiane Vulpius“.¹³ This thesis is backed up by Goethe's letters. Since 1788,¹⁴ he takes an interest in Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, the *triumviri* of his fifth elegy.¹⁵ This interest was aroused by the translation of Propertius by Karl Ludwig von Knebel, which Goethe followed closely. His work on elegies is testified first for 1788 and extends to 1790. With the exception of elegy 13,¹⁶ which appeared in *Berliner Deutsche Monatsschrift* in 1792, the elegies were not published until 1795, when they appeared in *Horen* on Schiller's initiative. Still, for reasons of decency Goethe dropped elegies 2 and 14 in his handwritten manuscript and switched elegies 3 and 4 for the publication.¹⁷ Only one year later, in *Horen* of 1796, a selection of

gebrauche, als gewöhnlich geschieht, werde ich bei Lesern, die tiefer in die Sache dringen, kaum zu verantworten brauchen. Meine Absicht ist keineswegs die Grenzen zu verrücken /.../; ich sehe bloß auf die in diesen Dichtungen herrschende Empfindungsweise, und es ist ja bekannt genug, daß diese sich keineswegs in jene engen Grenzen einschließen läßt. Elegisch rührt uns nicht bloß die Elegie, welche ausschließlich so genannt wird; auch der dramatische und epische Dichter können uns auf elegische Weise bewegen.“ (466 n.; vgl. 482 n.).

¹² In the manuscripts, the elegies are first called *Erotica Romana*, then *Elegien. Rom 1788*, finally only *Elegien*. The common name *Römische Elegien* is used by Goethe for the first time in 1799, then in the table of content of the works of 1806. Cf. *FA* 1084; *HA* 575; Wild (1996) 225–228.

¹³ *FA* 1088.

¹⁴ *FA* 1088f.

¹⁵ Letter to Knebel (25.10.1788): „Danke für das Kleeblatt der Dichter, ich besaß es nicht.“ (*WA* IV. 9, 44, Nr. 2691). The testimonies that Grumach (1949) 352f., 370 lists indicate that Goethe knew Catullus and Tibullus already before the trip to Italy. References to Propertius, however, are later (Grumach [1949] 371–377). Ovid was known to Goethe since his childhood (Grumach [1949] 377–385).

¹⁶ Nr. 14 in the manuscript of H⁵⁰ (vgl. *FA* 1085–1088).

¹⁷ *FA* 1088–1091.

the Propertius-translation by Knebel was published. As Schiller's *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* was published in the *Horen* in 1795/96, it is tempting to call these years the time of elegy in theory and poetry.

Three aspects of Goethe's *Römische Elegien* have attracted most attention in scholarship: first and most important, the question if there is a Roman "Urschicht"; second, the search for the mistress Faustine, who is referred to by name only in 18.9; third, the identification of Goethe's sources which did not even in the twentieth century stop producing monumental collections of parallels.¹⁸ It is safe to claim that the first and the second problems belong to the history of scholarship, although the identity of Faustine time and again inspires scholars, comparable to the identity of Catull's Lesbia, Gallus' Lycoris, Propertius' Cynthia, Tibullus' Delia, and Nemesis or Ovid's Corinna.¹⁹ As far as the influence of Roman elegy on Goethe is concerned, G. Luck (1978, 182) rightly points out: „Wer diese 'Parallelenester' genau untersucht, wird feststellen, daß von zwanzig behaupteten Abhängigkeiten oder Beziehungen kaum eine wirklich überzeugt.“²⁰ Yet, it is worth noting that Goethe explicitly puts himself into the tradition of Roman elegy—most obviously through the Latin letters, which he used in his handwriting.²¹ A direct allusion to Propertius can be found in elegy 16.19f., which was not printed ("Selig warst du Properz! Dir holte der Sklave die Dirnen / Vom Aventinus herab, aus dem Tarpeischen Hain", cf. Prop. 4.8). Moreover, the elegy *Hermann und Dorothea* (1796) starts with a reference to the model for *Römische Elegien* and *Venezianische Epigramme*: „Also das wäre Verbrechen, daß einst Properz mich begeistert; / Daß Martial sich zu mir auch, der Verwegne, gesellt?“ Finally, Goethe evidently enjoyed being seen in the tradition of Propertius as the change from "Priester Horaz" in 15.98 to „Priester Properz“ indicates, a change which Götting suggested in a letter (22.4.1827),²² but which was reversed later by Goethe.²³

¹⁸ Meissler (1987) 24–95 gives a discussion of the scholarship.

¹⁹ Cf., e.g. Zapperi (1999) 201–238.

²⁰ Luck (1978) 187–192. However, he gives himself a list of references to Propertius, which do not stand a closer scrutiny either.

²¹ *FA* 1085.

²² Cf. Grumach (1949) 376.

²³ „Priester Properz klingt zudem schlecht, und ich bin daher für die frühere Lesart.“ (Gespräche mit Eckermann, 17.3.1830).

The problems vanish once the search for parallels is replaced by the notion that Goethe, inspired by the cooperation with Knebel, develops a general elegiac register that, in accordance with the conception of *Römische Elegien*, establishes a dialogue of cultures and literatures across the centuries. Only the encounter with the pretty mistress and the reading of the ancient works (5.3) make the previously mute stones (1.4) of the city speak to him and lead to the enthusiasm on classical soil that he had longed for (V 1). Far from being distanced, alien, and closed, antiquity is accessible to everybody whom Roma and Amor (here, Goethe is playing with the palindrom as already ancient poets did)²⁴ inspire (13.17f., 21f.: „/ . . . / Die Schule der Griechen / Blieb noch offen, das Tor schlossen die Jahre nicht zu. / . . . / War das Antike doch neu, da jene Glücklichen lebten! / Lebe glücklich, und so lebe die Vorzeit in dir!“).²⁵ This presence of antiquity, its message to the world, is particularly visible in elegy 13. When at the end of this elegy, Goethe mentions „stillen Genuß reiner Betrachtung“ and praises „große Formen“ and „edel gewendete Glieder“ (48f.), Winckelmann’s concept immediately springs to the mind.²⁶ One could even claim that Goethe, regarding the sleeping beauty, manages to combine the studies of nature and antiquity and thus refutes the priority of art in Winckelmann’s system.²⁷ The sleeping mistress becomes the object of art, literature, and painting or sculpture, and at the same time remains the beautiful Roman woman. Beyond doubt, it is Propertius’ Cynthia after whom the girlfriend in *Römische Elegie* 13 is modelled.²⁸ Besides, Ariadne, sleeping on the beach of Naxos, is one of the favorite objects of ancient paint-

²⁴ Cf. Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae* 9.14.4: *Roma tibi subito montibus ibit Amor*. Cf. Kytzler (1993) 304.

²⁵ Cf. *Hermann und Dorothea* 3f.: „Daß ich die Alten nicht hinter mir ließ, die Schule zu hüten; / Daß sie nach Latium gern mir in das Leben gefolgt?“

²⁶ See in particular the famous word from *Über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst*: „Das allgemeine vorzügliche Kennzeichen der griechischen Meisterwerke ist endlich eine edle Einfalt, und eine stille Größe, sowohl in der Stellung als auch im Ausdrucke.“ (20).

²⁷ Cf. Winckelmann (1755) 13: „Das Studium der Natur muß also wenigstens ein längerer und mühsamerer Weg zur Kenntnis des vollkommen Schönen sein, als es das Studium der Antiken ist.“

²⁸ 1.3. 1f., 7f.: *Qualis Thesea iacuit cedente carina / languida desertis Cnosia litoribus / . . . / talis visa mihi mollem spirare quietem / Cynthia non certis nixa caput manibus*. There is a further reference to the poem by Propertius in *Der Besuch* (1788), hence, from the earliest phase of Goethe’s interest in Propertius; cf. Grumach (1949) 371–73. Propertius I 3 is also part of the edition of Knebel’s translation in *Horen*.

ings and ekphraseis that Goethe studied throughout his life.²⁹ The boundaries between foreground and background, modern age and antiquity, nature and art³⁰ are blurred.

The productive dialogue with antiquity is provoked and made possible by Amor. He conveys the material (*materia*) of poetry to the Roman elegiac poets, hitting them with his arrows, forcing them under love's yoke (*servitium amoris*) and prompting them to alter their lifestyle (Prop. 1.1). The composition of Goethe's *Römischen Elegie* resembles the beginning of Ovid's *Amores* (1.1–5). Hit by Amor's arrow, the poet first lacks the material (1.20) that ties in with the elegiac metre (1.3f., 27); without mistress he is haunted by insomnia (1.2, 1f.; vgl. *Römische Elegien* 18.4), until he bows to Amor (1.2.9f.) and, being prey to a girl (1.2.29; 1.3.1f.), joins the ranks of Amor's troops. The *puella* inspires him to write poetry, becomes the topic of his poetry (1.3.19f.), and gives him—only now is she referred to by name (1.5, 9f.)—the joy of love. The structure of *Römische Elegien* is similar: without the mistress that he desires to find (1.5f.), the genius does not move (1.2) and the stones remain mute. Amor's arrows (3.6) open the previously locked world (5) and provide him with poetic material (13.23, 27), that, as it turns out later (18.9), is Faustine³¹ (20.21: „Dir, Hexameter, dir, Pentameter, sei es vertraut.“).

The elegiac Amor of *Römische Elegien* is evidently modeled after the Eros of the Platonic *Symposium*,³² who is an interpreter and bridges

²⁹ Cf. Philostrat, *Eikones* 1.16.3: „Betrachte auch Ariadne oder vielmehr ihren Schlaf! Der Busen ist hin bis zur Mitte des Leibes entblößt; der Hals ist zurückgebogen, zart die Kehle, das Innere der rechten Achsel liegt ganz offen, und die andere Hand ruht auf dem Kleid, damit der Wind nichts entblößen kann. Wie lockend und süß, Dionysos, ihr Atem! Ob er aber nach Äpfeln oder Trauben duftet, kannst du erst nach dem Kusse sagen.“ (translation by Schönberger [1968] 129). On the description of Ariadne by Goethe cf. Schönberger (1968) 326f.; on ancient paintings 329; on the testimonies for Goethe's interest in Philostratus cf. Grumach (1949) 880–85; see also Zimmermann (1999).

³⁰ Cf. 13.40 „Denkmal“.

³¹ Like the *puellae* of Roman elegy, she turns into a muse (cf. the reference to Apollo in Lycoris, Delia, Cynthia); at the same time, her name “the one who brings fortune” draws attention to a major distinction from Roman elegy, as there is no unhappy love in *Römische Elegien*.

³² On Goethe's knowledge of Plato cf. Grumach (1949) 753–58. There is a revealing episode from *Italiens Reise* (WA I 32, 106), in which Goethe reports about his reception by the society of the Arcadians: „Nun aber bestand die Gesellschaft aus geistlichen Herren und sonstigen würdigen Personen, die sich mit dem Amor jener römischen Triumvirn nicht einlassen durften, den sie deshalb ausdrücklich

the gap between the worlds of the past and the present (*Symposion* 202c2–7). He establishes the dialogue between antiquity and present and fills the lover with divine enthusiasm (*entheos*, 180b4). And he can make him a poet, even though he was not familiar with the muses before (196elf.). I cautiously suggest that the term “Sophist” (25) in elegy 13 refers to the Platonic Eros (cf. *Symposion* 203d8).

Although Goethe evokes Roman elegy in his *Römische Elegien* in many passages, a particular point of reference is—with very few exceptions—hard to find. He refers to the genre as a whole, to the *triumviri* Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, who are joined by Ovid. Among these, Propertius stands out, surely due to Goethe’s contact with Knebel, while he composed *Römische Elegien*. Many motives and topoi establish links between the *Römische Elegien* and Roman elegy: the combination of life, love, literature and Rome as place of *cultus* and *urbanitas*, which can not be found in the barbarian surroundings of the north, Amor as a source of inspiration and the mistress as topic, programmatic comments on literature, the rejection of high politics (2, 15). These similarities throw the differences into relief: at the core of *Römische Elegien*, there is neither a femme fatale nor insecurity, but a faithful mistress, the relation with whom looks like a stable marriage. The ideal of harmony between art and nature, present and past is expressed in the harmonic relation with Faustine. The only shadows threatening in *Römischen Elegien*, are not potential lovers of Faustina (6), but the north (7, 15.3) and the anxiety to be expelled from the Roman paradise. Rome becomes the true home; the actual home turns into a nightmare. By integrating a variety of ancient subtexts into *Römische Elegien*, which range from Homer’s *Odyssey* (19) over Plato to Roman elegy, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (20), and the *Vita Hadriana* (15), and by referring to Greco-Roman myths or making them up as aetiologies (Fama und Amor in 19), Goethe sides with Winckelmann: antiquity, Greece and Rome taken as a unity, is the ideal model³³ and no distant, closed period nor a boring topic at school, but an engaging present.

beseitigten. Hier also blieb nichts übrig, da dem Dichter die Liebe ganz unentbehrlich ist, als sich zu jener überirdischen und gewissermaßen Platonischen Sehnsucht hinzuwenden“. Grumach (1949) 757.

³³ This comes nicely to the fore in Goethe’s comment on Philemon und Baucis in *Faust* II 5, 11043ff. (Gespräche mit Eckermann, 6.6.1831; Grumach [1949] 385): „Mein Philemon und Baucis hat mit jenem berühmten Paare des Altertums und

III

"And if you CAN'T find *any* decent translation of Catullus and Propertius, I suppose I shall have to rig up something."³⁴ In 1916 Pound starts taking an interest in Propertius, who had not received much attention in modern European literature. The result was *Homage to Sextus Propertius* (finished in 1917), which first appeared in excerpts in *Poetry* 13/6, March 1919, 291–99 under the title *Poems from the Propertius Series* and then, in six parts, as *Homage to Sextus Propertius* in *The New Age* 20, 1919.³⁵ The reaction of William Grandner Hale, professor of Latin at the University of Chicago, is not only famous, but also had a huge influence on Pound's reception. He gives a list of translation errors and closes with the following comment: "If Mr. Pound were a professor of Latin, there would be nothing left for him but suicide. I do not counsel this. But I beg him to lay aside the mask of erudition. And if he must deal with Latin, I suggest he paraphrase some accurate translation, and then employ some respectable student of the language to save him from blunders which might still be possible."³⁶ Pound was hurt and irritated. He did not grow tired of pointing out that he had never intended to translate Propertius. "No, I have not done a translation of Propertius. That fool in Chicago took the *Homage* for a translation, despite the mention of Wordsworth and the parodied line from Yeats."³⁷ A new positive assessment of the *Homage* started with T. S. Eliot's appreciation: "If the uninstructed reader is not a classical scholar, he will wonder why this does not conform to his notions of what translation should be. It is not a translation; it is a paraphrase, or still more truly (for the instructed) a *persona*. It is also a criticism of Propertius, a criticism which in a most interesting way insists upon an element of humor, of irony and mockery, in Propertius, which Mackail and other interpreters have missed. I think that Pound is critically right,

der sich daran knüpfenden Sage nichts zu tun. Ich gab meinem Paare bloß jene Namen, um die Charaktere dadurch zu heben. Es sind ähnliche Personen und ähnliche Verhältnisse, und da wirken denn die ähnlichen Namen durchaus günstig."

³⁴ Pound (1950) 91.

³⁵ Later in E. Pound, *Poems 1918–21* (New York) 1921 and *Personae. The Collected Poems of Ezra Pound*, New York 1926 (London 1952); cf. Sullivan (1964) 110f.

³⁶ The attack was published under the title "Pegasus Impounded" in *Poetry* 14 (1919) 52–55. On other reviews see Sullivan (1964) 4–16.

³⁷ Pound (1950) 245 (dating from 1922).

and that Propertius was more civilized than most of his interpreters have admitted.”³⁸

Already the title of the work should have prevented critics from taking it as a translation. Instead, it is homage to a poet, who, in Pound’s eyes, has realized his idea of “logopoeia” as “the dance of intellect among words”.³⁹ Pound consciously placed himself in the tradition of Roman poets: Virgil’s eclogue 10 can be read as a homage to Cornelius Gallus, Ovid’s *Amores* 3.9, the Tibullus-obituary, can be taken as a homage to the elegiac poet, both containing poetological levels with reflections on the genre of elegy and its opportunities. Pound did not want to give a translation, but rather creatively revive Propertius along the lines of his own understanding. He wanted to bring Propertius closer to the modern reader. Thus, he introduced the anachronisms for which he has been blamed time and again: “Wordsworthian” in Section XII (Prop. 2.34, 77) or “Nor welsh mines and the profit Marus had out of them” in Section V 2 (Prop. 2.1, 24: *Cimbrorumque minas et benefacta Mari*). Particularly “Wordsworthian” is a good example for Pound’s technique of transformation. In 2.34, 77f.: *tu canis Ascraei poetae, / quo seges in campo, quo viret uva iugo*, Propertius refers, in accordance with the conventions of Augustean literature, to the author, Hesiod, by the place of birth, i.e., Ascra in Boeotia, and circumscribes the work’s title, *Works and Days*, by its content.⁴⁰ Pound transforms the distich to “Go on, to Ascraeus’ prescription, the ancient, respected, Wordsworthian:” / “A flat field for rushes, grapes grow on the slope.” *Ascraeus*, the man from Ascra, is not transformed, but explained by a modern parallel, Wordsworth, to the reader. Besides, the “prescription” of Hesiod sounds like the moral tone of Wordsworth’s descriptions of nature and landscapes.⁴¹ Both difference (*Ascraeus*) and presence (Wordsworthian) of antiquity are emphasized, as Pound aims at expressing the ancient poet’s specific character and making it understandable to the modern reader.

The reference to an older poet from another culture, which we find in Pound’s *Homage*, is typical of Augustean poetry: the *aemulatio*

³⁸ In: Ezra Pound, *Selected Poems* (London 1948) XXIII.

³⁹ Pound (1954) 33.

⁴⁰ Cf. Ovid, *Amores* 1.15.10f.: *vivet et Ascraeus, dum mustis uva tumebit, / dum cadet in curva falce resecta Ceres*.

⁴¹ Cf. Wordsworths *An Evening Walk* (1787–1789) oder *Descriptive Sketches* (1792).

of Greek models. Accordingly, Pound frames the cycle with poetological poems.⁴² In the same way that Propertius was the first to introduce the poetry of Callimachus and Philitas in Rome, Pound grasps the spirit of Propertius' poetry and makes it accessible to the presence (Section I)⁴³ and closes with Propertius 2.34, a catalogue of poets and their mistresses whose praise made the poets immortal (Section XII). In order to bring out the essential aspects of Propertius' poetry, Pound makes use of 'Verdichtung'; this is particularly clear in Section VI, where he melts verses from different elegies (2.13b, 3.4, 3.5)⁴⁴ and establishes the mournful tenor of the genre.

The polyphony of ancient texts for modern readers, i.e., the possibility to read them from different perspectives depending on the recipient's erudition, comes to the fore in the direct speeches that have no parallels in Propertius: *quod sie deficiant vires, audacia certe / laus erit: in magnis et voluisse sat est.* (Prop. 2.10, 5f.)—If I have not the faculty, "The bare attempt would be praiseworthy." / "In things of similar magnitude / the mere will to act is sufficient." (Pound, Section V). The voices reply to the objections in the conditional clause either presented by anonymous readers or to be explained as a second, albeit own voice of the narrating I, somewhat like an interior monologue.

There is a particularly striking example for a direct speech in Section 3 (Prop. 3.16, 1–4): *Nox media, et dominae mihi venit epistula nostrae: / Tibure me missa iussit adesse mora, / candida qua geminas ostendunt culmina turris, / et cadit in patulos nympha Aniena lacus.*—Midnight, and a letter comes to me from our mistress: / Telling me to come to Tibur, At once!! / "Bright tips reach up from twin towers, / Anienan spring water falls into flat-spread pools."

A letter from his mistress requests Propertius in the middle of the night to come to Tibur. The word "Tibur" evokes in a kind of interior monologue the image of Tibur for Propertius. The conjunctions *qua* and *et* are dropped in Pound's transferral so that the image is more immediate. Pound himself reflects on 'phanopoeia', "which is

⁴² Cf. Comber (1998) 52–55.

⁴³ Propertius 3.1.1–4: *Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philetas, / in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus. / primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos / Italia per Graios orgia ferre choros.* Pound, *Homage I*: "Shades of Callimachus, Coan ghosts of Philetas, / It is in your grove I would walk, / I who come first from the clae font / Bringing the Grecian orgies into Italy, / and the dance into Italy."

⁴⁴ Cf. Sullivan (1964) 112.

casting of images upon the visual imagination".⁴⁵ He adopts Propertius' *nox media* and intensifies it. Finally, this passage reveals another principle of Pound's poetry, the melopoeia, "wherein the words are charged, over and above their plain meaning with some musical property, which directs the bearing or trend of their meaning."⁴⁶ Through the alliterations "Telling me to come to Tibur, *At* once!!" (which are not in Propertius), the exhortative character is underlined, in the verse "Anienan spring water falls into flat-spread pools", the dark sound makes the flowing of water perceivable.

While Goethe's *Römische Elegien* are the expression of a revived antiquity, Pound's *Homage* marks the gap between the vanishing ancient tradition and the present. The elated language, sometimes even in archaizing style,⁴⁷ is meant to create a tension to modern English. Numerous anachronisms take the author into the present; yet, the mythological and historical exempla emphasize the distance, part of them in the same line as in Section XII: "Upon the Actian marshes Virgil is Phoebus' chief of police". It is the privilege of the *lector doctus* to fully understand the work of the *poeta doctus*; only he can enjoy the net of allusions, irony, and parody and grasps the subtle play with the cultural memory that Propertius and Pound are playing.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ This is Pound's definition according to Sullivan (1964) 65. This rhetorical technique is called *eidolopoia* or *phantasia* by Pseudo-Longin, *De sublimitate* 15.1f. and *visio* by Quintilian (6.2.32).

⁴⁶ Pound, according to Sullivan (1964) 65.

⁴⁷ In some passages, parody comes to the fore, parody of translators' English.

⁴⁸ Some of the translation errors can be explained as play with the cultural memory, the readers' knowledge of Latin. On this, cf. Sullivan (1964) 95–104; Fedeli (1988).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, W., (1930) *Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern. Untersuchungen zur elegischen Form* (Diss. Berlin).
- Abt, A., (1908) *Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die antike Zauberei* (Giessen).
- Albanese, G., (1986) 'Le raccolte poetiche latine di Francesco Filelfo', in: *Francesco Filelfo nel quinto centenario della morte. Atti del XVII Convegno di studi maceratesi (Tolentino, 27-30 settembre 1981)* (Padova) (*Medioevo e umanesimo* 58), 389-458.
- Alfonsi, L., (1945) *L'Elegia di Propertio* (Milan).
- , (1946) *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del 'Corpus Tibullianum'* (Milan).
- Allen, A. W., (1962) 'Sunt qui Propertium malint', in: J. P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical essays on Roman literature. Elegy and lyric* (London, repr.) 107-48.
- Allison, J. W., (1980) 'Propertius 4, 7, 94', *AJP* 101, 170-73.
- Álvarez Hernández, A., (1997) *La Poética di Propertio. Autobiografía del 'Calimaco romano'* (Assisi).
- Anderson, R. D., Parson, P. J., and Nisbet, R. G. M., (1979) 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrīm', *JRS* 69, 125-55.
- Anderson, W. S., (1964) 'Hercules exclusus: Propertius IV, 9', *AJP* 85, 1-12.
- , (1992) 'The limits of genre: response to Francis Cairns', in: *The interpretation of Roman poetry: empiricism or hermeneutics?*, ed. K. Galinsky (*Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 67) (Frankfurt) 96-103.
- Annibali, F., (1995) *Guida al Museo Civico di Assisi e agli Scavi Archeologici della Città* (Assisi).
- Arkin, B., (1989) 'Language in Propertius 4.6', *Philologus* 133, 246-51.
- Asper, M., (1997) *Onomata allotria: zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Stuttgart).
- Assfahl, G., (1932) *Vergleich und Metapher bei Quintilian* (Stuttgart).
- Baglio, M., (2004) 'Le postille del Petrarca a Virgilio', in: *Francesco Petrarca. Manoscritti e libri a stampa della Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, a cura di M. Ballarini/G. Frasso/C. Monti (Milano) 29-39.
- Baehrens, A., (1880) *Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV. Recensuit Aem. Baehrens* (Lipsiae).
- Baier, Th., (2001) 'Die Imitatio antiker Vorbilder durch Petrus Lotichius Secundus am Beispiel der Magdeburg-Elegie (2, 4)', in: U. Auhagen/E. Schäfer (edd.), *Lotichius und die römische Elegie* (Tübingen) 97-114.
- Baker, R. J., (1968) 'Miles annosus: The military motif in Propertius', *Latomus* 27, 322-49.
- , (1970) 'Laus in amore mori: Love and death in Propertius', *Latomus* 29, 670-98.
- , (1980) 'Beauty and the Beast in Propertius I.3', in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History. II* (Bruxelles) (*Collection Latomus, vol. 168*) 245-58.
- , (1983) 'Caesaris in nomen (Propertius IV.iv)', *RhM* 126, 153-74.
- , (2000) *Propertius I. Translated with Introduction, Literary Commentary and Latin Text* (Armidale 1990) (*University of New England. Teaching Monograph Series* 8)—*Propertius I. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Warminster, 2nd ed.).
- Bakhtin, M., (1963) *Проблемы поэтики Достоевского* (Moscow).
- , (1965) *Творчество Франсуа Рабле* (Moscow).
- Barber, E. A., (1929) Review of Richmond (1928), *JRS* 19, 239-43.
- , (1953; 2nd ed 1960) *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford).

- Barsby, J. A., (1974) 'The composition and publication of the first three books of Propertius', *G&R* 21, 128–37.
- Batstone, W. W., (1992) 'Amor Impotens, Felix Qui, and Tardus Apollo: The Monobiblos and the Georgics', *CPh* 87, 287–02.
- Becker, C., (1966) 'Horos redselig?' (Zu Properz IV 1), *WS* 79, 442–51.
- , (1971) 'Die späten Elegien des Properz', *Hermes* 99, 449–80.
- Bennett, A. W., (1967) 'Sententia and catalogue in Propertius 3.9.1–20', *Hermes* 95, 222–43.
- Bernardini Marzolla, P., (1955) 'Tre elegie di Properzio', *Maia* 7, 163–83.
- Beroaldo, P., (1486–1487) *Commentarii in Propertium a Phil. Beroaldo editi* (Bononiae).
- Besomi, O., (1970) 'Un nuovo autografo di Giovanni Tortelli: uno schedario di umanista', in: O. Besomi/M. Regoliosi, *Valla e Tortelli*, *IMU* 13, 95–137.
- Besomi, O./Regoliosi M., (1984) *Laurentii Valle Epistole* (1984) edd. O. Besomi/M. Regoliosi (Padova) (*Thesaurus mundi* 24).
- Bianca, C., (1983) 'Marianus de Magistris de Urbe', in: *Scrittura, biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento. Atti del secondo seminario, 6–8 maggio 1982*, a cura di M. Miglio . . . [et al.] (Roma) Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia e diplomatica e archivistica (*Littera antiqua* 3), 555–99.
- Bianchi, R./Rizzo, S., (2000) 'Manoscritti e opere grammaticali nella Roma di Niccolò V', in: *Manuscripts and tradition of grammatical texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 16–23 October 1997, as the 11th Course of International School for the study of written records*, ed. by M. De Nonno/P. De Paolis/L. Holtz, II (Cassino) 587–653.
- Billanovich, G., (1958) "Veterum vestigia vatum" nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani. Lovato Lovati, Zambono di Andrea, Albertino Mussato e Lucrezio, Catullo, Orazio (Carmina), Tibullo, Properzio, Ovidio (Ibis), Marziale, Stazio (Silvae)', *IMU* 1, 155–243.
- Binder, G., (1971) *Aeneas und Augustus. Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis*, (*Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 38) (Meisenheim).
- Binder G./Hamm, U., (1998) 'Die "Locke der Berenike" und der Ursprung der römischen Liebeselegie', in: Radke (1998) 12–34.
- Birt, Th., (1882) *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur. Mit Beiträgen zur Textgeschichte des Theokrit, Catull, Properz und anderer Autoren* (Berlin).
- , (1895) 'Die vaticanische Ariadne und die dritte Elegie des Properz', *RhM* 50, 31–65, 161–190.
- Bischoff, B., (1994) *Manuscripts and libraries in the age of Charlemagne* (Cambridge) (*Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology* 1).
- Bise Casella, M. T., (1996) *Il commento di Filippo Beroaldo a Properzio*, in: AA.VV., *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann* (Assisi) 135–51.
- Blänsdorf, J. (ed.), (1995) *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium* (Stuttgart).
- Boldrer, F., (1999) *L'elegia di Vertumno: (Properzio 4.2): introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Amsterdam).
- Bonner, S. F., (1949) *Roman declamation in the late Republic and early Empire* (Liverpool).
- Booth, J., (2001a) 'Problems and Programmatics in Propertius 1.1', *Hermes* 129, 63–74.
- , (2001b) 'Moonshine: intertextual illumination in Propertius 1.3.31–3 and Philodemus, *Anth. Pal.* 5.123', *CQ* 51, 537–44.
- Botterweck, G. J., (1977) and Ringgren, H. (edd.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (Stuttgart), II, cols. 288 seqq. (Bergman, Haldar-Ringgren, Koch).
- Boucher, J.-P., (1965) *Études sur Properce: Problèmes d'Inspiration et d'Art* (Paris).
- , (1966) *C. Cornelius Gallus* (Paris).
- Brancaleone, F., (2000) 'Monobiblos', *DNP* 8 (Stuttgart/Weimar), 368–69.
- Bright, D., (1978) *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in his World* (Leiden).

- Brink, C. O., (1972) 'Ennius and the Hellenistic Worship of Homer', *AJPh* 93, 547–67.
- Broukhusius, I., (1702) *Sex. Aur. Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor ad fidem veterum membranarum curis secundis I. Broukhusii sedulo castigati* (Amstelaedami).
- Buchheit, V., (1965) 'Tibull 2.5', *Philologus* 109, 184–200.
- Burck, E., (1952) 'Römische Wesenszüge der augusteischen Liebeselegie', *Hermes* 87, 163–200.
- , (1966a) *Vom Menschenbild in der römischen Literatur*. Bd. 1 (Heidelberg).
- , (1966b) 'Zur Komposition des vierten Buches des Properz', *WS* 79, 405–427.
- Burkert, W., (1994) *Antike Mysterien* (München).
- Burman, P., (1780) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum libri IV. Cum commentario perpetuo Petri Burmanni Secundi et multis doctorum notis ineditis. Opus Burmanni morte interruptum Laurentius Santenius absolvit* (Trajecti ad Rhenum).
- Butler, H. E./Barber, E. A., (eds.) (1933) *The Elegies of Propertius. Edited with an introduction and commentary* (Oxford).
- Butrica, J. L., (1984) *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Phoenix Supplementary Volume 17) (Toronto).
- , (1992) Review of Goold (1990), *Phoenix* 46, 45–48.
- , (1993) 'Propertius' horoscope and a birthplace rejected', *Cph* 88, 330–331.
- , (1996a) 'The Amores of Propertius: Unity and Structure in Books II–IV', *ICS* 21, 87–158.
- , (1996b) 'Two two-part poems in Propertius Book 1 (1.8; 1.11 and 12)', in: F. Cairns/M. Heath (edd.), *Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Poetry, Etymology, Historiography. Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 9, 1996, Leeds (ARCA 34), 83–91.
- , (1996c) 'Hellenistic erotic elegy: the evidence of the papyri', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 9, 297–322.
- , (1997) 'Editing Propertius', *CQ* 47, 176–208.
- , (1999) 'The Life and Career of Propertius in the Scholarship of the Early Renaissance', *GIF* 51, 179–212.
- , (2000) 'Propertius on the Parilia (4.4.73–8)', *CQ* 50, 472–78.
- , (2001) 'Apollo Actius, Apollo Leucadius: A False Problem in Latin Poetry', in: M. Joyal (ed.), *In Altum: Seventy-Five Years of Classical Studies in Newfoundland* (St. John's) 289–311.
- , (2002) 'Propertius and the Myth of the Itali', in: G. Catanzaro (ed.), *Propertio alle soglie del 2000: Un bilancio di fine secolo. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Assisi, 25–28 maggio 2000* (Assisi) 349–88.
- Cairns, F., (1969) 'Propertius i.18 and Callimachus, Acontius and Cydippe', *CR* 19, 131–34.
- , (1972) *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- , (1977) 'Two Unidentified *Komoi* of Propertius. I 3 and II 29', *Emerita* 45, 325–53.
- , (1979) *Tibullus: a Hellenistic poet at Rome* (Cambridge).
- , (1983) 'Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the "Gallus" of the Monobiblos', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4, 61–102.
- , (1984) 'Propertius and the battle of Actium (IV.6)', in: *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus*, ed. T. Woodman/D. West (Cambridge).
- , (1986) 'Stile e Contenuti di Tibull ed Properzio', in: *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi su Albio Tibullo* (Rome).
- , (1992) 'Propertius IV, 9', in: *The interpretation of Roman poetry: empiricism or hermeneutics?*, ed. K. Galinsky (*Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 67) (Frankfurt).
- , (2000) 'Allusions to <<hunc... meum esse aio>> in Propertius?', *RPL N.S.* 3, 168–181.
- , (2003) 'Propertius 3.4 and the Aeneid Incipit', *CQ* 53, 309–11.
- Calderini, D., (1475) *Status: Silvarum libri V, add. Ovidius: Sapho, Domitii Calderini elucubratio in quaedam Propertii loca* (Romae).

- Calboli, G., (1969) *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, introd., testo crit., comm. a cura di G. Calboli (Bologna).
- Cameron, A., (1980) 'Poetae Novelli', *HSCP* 84, 127–75.
- , (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton).
- Camps, W. A., (1961–1967) *Propertius. Elegies*, 4 voll. (Cambridge).
- Canter, H. V., (1925) *Rhetorical elements in the tragedies of Seneca* (Urbana).
- Caputo, R., (1998) 'Petrarca e Properzio', in: *A confronto con Properzio (da Petrarca a Pound). Atti del Convegno internazionale, Assisi, 17–19 maggio 1996*, a cura di G. Catanzaro e F. Santucci, Assisi, Accademia properziana del Subasio (*Centro studi poesia latina in distici elegiaci* 5), 113–23.
- Casella, M. T./Pozzi, G., (1984) 'Una "predica d'amore" attribuita a Francesco Colonna', in: *Vestigia. Studi in onore di G. Billanovich*, a cura di R. Avesani . . . , I (Roma) (*Storia e letteratura* 162), 159–80.
- Citroni, M., (1995) *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica. Forme della comunicazione letteraria* (Bari).
- Clarke, M. L., (1949) 'Rhetorical influences in the Aeneid', *G&R* 18, 14–27.
- Clausen, W., (1982) 'The New Direction in Poetry', in: E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, Vol. II: Latin Literature* (Cambridge) 178–206.
- , (1987) *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley).
- , (1994) *A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (Oxford).
- Colonna, Fr., (1980) *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, Ed. critica e commento a cura di G. Pozzi e L. A. Ciapponi, I–II (Padova) (*Medioevo e umanesimo* 38–39).
- Comber, M., (1998) 'A Book Made New: Reading Propertius Reading Pound. A Study in Reception', *JRS* 88, 37–55.
- Commager, S., (1962) *The Odes of Horace* (New Haven).
- Conte, G. B./Barchiesi, A., (1989) 'Imitazione e arte allusiva. Modi e funzioni dell'intertestualità', in: G. Cavallo u.a. (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica* (Roma) 81–114.
- Copley, F. O., (1947) 'Seruitium amoris in the Roman elegists', *TAPhA* 78, 285–300.
- Coppini, D., (1996) 'Il Properzio di Domizio Calderini' in: AA.VV., *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann* (Assisi) 27–80.
- Courtney, E., (1968) 'The Structure of Propertius Book I and Some Textual Consequences', *Phoenix* 22, 250–58.
- , (1987) 'Quotation, interpolation, transposition', *Hermathena* 143, 7–18.
- , (1993) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, paperback revised ed. 2003).
- Cramer, F., (1954) *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia).
- Crowther, N. B., (1983) 'C. Cornelius Gallus: His Importance in the Development of Roman Poetry', *ANRW* II.30.3, 1622–1648.
- , (1987) 'Varro Atacinus, traditional or neoteric poet?', *AC* 56, 262–268.
- Curran, L. C., (1966) 'Vision and reality in Propertius 1.3', *YCS* 19, 189–207.
- D'Anna, G., (1986) 'L'evoluzione della poetica properziana', in: G. Catanzaro/F. Santucci (edd.), *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi properziani*. Roma—Assisi, 21–26 maggio 1985 (Assisi) 53–74.
- Damon, P. W. and Helmbold, W. C., (1953) 'The Structure of Propertius, Book 2', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 14.6, 215–53.
- Davis, J., (1977) *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid (Noctes Romanae 15)* (Bern).
- Day, A. A., (1938) *The Origins of Latin Love-Poetry* (Oxford).
- de Decker, J., (1913) *Juvenalis declamans* (Gent).
- De Robertis, D., (1985) 'Iohannes Carpensius/Giovanni de Carpi', in: *Tradizione classica e letteratura umanistica*. Per A. Perosa, a cura di R. Cardini et al., I (Roma) (*Humanistica* 3), 255–96.
- Decembrio, Angelo Camillo, (2002) *De politia litteraria*, hg. v. N. Witten (München/Leipzig) (*Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 169).

- Déonna, W., (1939) 'La soif des morts', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 109, 53–77.
- Dimundo, R., (1990) *Properzio 4,7.: dalla variante di un modello letterario alla costante di un' unità tematica* (Bari).
- Dingel, J., (1988) *Scholastica materia: Untersuchungen zu den Declamationes Minores und der Institutio Oratoria Quintilianus* (Berlin and New York).
- Dolla, V., (1987) 'Echi properziani nella cultura e nella poesia dei secoli XIII e XIV', in: *Properzio nella letteratura italiana. Atti del Convegno Nazionale (Assisi, 15–17 novembre 1985)*, a cura di S. Pasquazi (Roma) 21–40.
- Dominik, W. J., (1997) *Roman eloquence: rhetoric in society and literature* (London/New York).
- Donati, G., (2000) *Pietro Odo da Montopoli e la biblioteca di Niccolò V, con osservazioni sul De orthographia di Tortelli* (Roma) (R.R. inedita, 21. Saggi).
- Dousa fil., (1592) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, iam pridem viri docti iudicio castigati et nunc demum recogniti ac variis lectionibus et notis illustrati a Iano Dousa filio* (Lugduni Batavorum).
- Dousa pat.—Dousa fil., (1581) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, cum Praecidaneis Jani Dousae pro Catullo, et coniectaneis Jani Dousae filii in eodem, et patris Paralipomena in Propertium* (Lugduni Batavorum).
- Dover, K. J., (1971) *Theocritus* (London).
- Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M., (1979) 'From Polyphemus to Corydon', in: D. West and A. J. Woodman (edd.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge) 35–69.
- Dunn, F. M., (1985) 'The Lover Reflected in the *Exemplum*: A Study of Propertius 1. 3 and 2. 6', *ICS* 10, 233–59.
- Eckert, V., (1985) *Untersuchungen zur Einheit von Properz I* (Heidelberger Forschungen, 26. Heft) (Heidelberg).
- Eisenhut, W. (ed.), (1975) *Properz* (Darmstadt).
- Enk, P. J., (1946) *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos), cum prolegomenis, conspectu librorum et commentationum ad IV libros Propertii pertinentium, notis criticis, commentario exegetico*, 2 voll. (Leiden).
- , (1962) *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber II* (Leiden).
- Erich, V., (1955) *Russian Formalism* (The Hague).
- Fantham, E., (1972) *Comparative studies in Republican Latin imagery* (Toronto).
- , (1992) 'Stuprum: public attitudes and penalties for sexual offences in Republican Rome', *Classical Views* 10, 267–91.
- , (1996) *Roman Literary Culture* (Baltimore/London).
- , (1997) 'Images from the city: Propertius' new-old Rome', in: *The Roman cultural revolution*, ed. T. Habinek/A. Schiesaro (Cambridge).
- , (2000) 'Roman elegy: problems of self-definition and redirection', in: *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 47)* (Vandoeuvres-Genève) 183–211 (discussion, 212–20).
- Faral, E., (1924) *Les Arts Poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e Siècle* (Paris).
- Fedeli, P., (1965) *Properzio. Elegie. Libro IV, testo critico e commento a cura di P. F.* (Bari)
- , (1974) 'Properzio 1,3. Interpretazione e proposte sull'origine della elegia latina', *MH* 31, 23–41.
- , (1980) *Sesto Properzio. Il primo libro delle elegie. Introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Florence).
- , (1981) 'Elegy and Literary Polemic in Propertius' *Monobiblos*', in: F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3, 1981, Leeds, *ARCA* 7, 227–42.
- , (1983) 'Propertii monobiblos': struttura e motivi', in: *ANRW* II.30.3 (Berlin/New York) 1858–1922.
- , (1984) *Sexti Propertii elegiarum libri IV*, (Stuttgart, ed. corr. 1994).
- , (1985a) *Propertius. Codex Guelferbytanus Gudianus 224 olim Neapolitanus* (Assisi).
- , (1985b) *Properzio. Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie* (Bari).
- , (1986) 'Properzio e l'amore elegiaco', in: *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi properziani, Roma-Assisi 21–26 maggio 1985* (Assisi).

- , (1987) 'Properzio, fra culto del testo tràdito e caccia alla corruttela', *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Mulhouse* 15, 107–12.
- , (1988) 'La traduzione 'pastiche': Il Properzio di Ezra Pound', *Lexis* 2, 225–33.
- , (1994) 'Ideologia augustea e poesia: il mito di Ercole e Caco in Properzio', in: *Macht und Kultur in Rom der Kaiserzeit*, ed. K. Rosen (*Studium universale* 16) (Bonn) 109–19.
- , (1996) 'Il Properzio di Lachman' in: AA.VV., *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann* (Assisi) 355–80.
- , (1999) 'Properzio, fra Burman e Lachmann' in: *Studi sulla tradizione classica per Mariella Cagnetta*, a cura di L. Canfora (Roma-Bari) 241–58.
- Fedeli, P.,/Pinotti, P., (1985) *Bibliografia properziana (1946–1983)* (Assisi) (*Atti Accademia Properziana del Subasio*, Ser. VI, n. 9).
- Feeney, D. C., (1990) 'The Taciturnity of Aeneas', in: S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford) 167–90.
- Fitzgerald, W., (1987) *Agonistic Poetry* (Berkeley).
- Flach, D., (1998) 'Properz als Dichter des Maecenaskreises', in: Radke (1998) 67–79.
- Fleischmann, H., (1895) *Quaestionum Propertianarum pars prior* (Programm Bielitz).
- Fordyce, C. J., (1961) *Catullus* (Oxford).
- , (1981) 'Elegy and literary polemic in Propertius', *PLLS* 3, 227–42.
- Foulon, A., (1996) 'La mort et l'au-delà chez Properce', *REL* 74, 155–67.
- Fowler, D. P., (2000) 'Catullus 68 and Propertius 1.10: A Note', in: Vicente Bécáres Botas (ed.), *Intertextualidad en las literaturas griega y latina* (Madrid) 233–40.
- Fraenkel, E., (1956) 'Catull's Trostgedicht für Calvus', *WS* 69, 278–88 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome 1964) 102–13.
- , (1960) *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence).
- , (1961) 'Two poems of Catullus', *JRS* 51, 46–53.
- Franceschini, A., (1976) 'Giovanni Aurispa e la sua biblioteca. Notizie e documenti', (Padova) (*Medioevo e umanesimo* 25).
- Fränkel, H., (1945) *Ovid: a poet between two worlds* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Fraser, P. M., (1972) *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 voll. (Oxford).
- Führer, R., (1996) 'Nochmals zu P.Oxy. 3723 (Hellenistische Liebeselegie?)', *ΣPE* 112, 67–8.
- , (1998) 'P.Oxy. 3723: Philetas?', *ΣPE* 122, 47–48.
- Fumagalli, E., (1984) 'Un falso tardo-quattrocentesco: lo pseudo-Catone di Annio da Viterbo', in: *Vestigia. Studi in onore di G. Billanovich*, a cura di R. Avesani ..., I (Roma) (*Storia e letteratura* 162), 337–63.
- Galinsky, G. K., (1972) *The Herakles Theme. Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century* (Oxford).
- Gall, D., (1999) *Zur Technik von Anspielung und Zitat in der römischen Dichtung: Vergil, Gallus und die Ciris* (*Zetemata* 100) (Munich).
- Ganda, A., (1993) 'La biblioteca latina e greca del cremonese Bartolomeo Petroni precettore alla corte sforzesca', in: *Mercurius in trivio. Studi di Bibliografia e di Biblioteconomia per Alfredo Serrai*, a cura di M. Cochetti (Roma) 221–77.
- Gargan, L., (1983) 'Un umanista ritrovato: Galeazzo Facino e la sua biblioteca', *IMU* 26, 257–305.
- Garin, E., (1958) *Il pensiero pedagogico dell'umanesimo* (Firenze).
- Georg, B., (2001) *Exegetische und schmückende Eindichtungen im ersten Properzbuch* (Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich) (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, Neue Folge, 1. Reihe: Monographien, 17. Bd.).
- George, A. (ed.), (1999) *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Harmondsworth).
- Germano, G., (1985) *Per l'edizione critica del De aspiratione di Giovanni Pontano* (Napoli) Istituto Nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento meridionale (*Studi* 2).
- , (1974) 'Los topicos helenísticos en la elegia latina', *Emerita* 42, 1–36.
- Giangrande, G., (1986) Review of Fedeli (1984), *RFIC* 114, 210–18.

- Giardina, I. C., (1977) *Sex. Propertii liber II* (Torino).
- Giazzi, E., (2003) 'La lettera di Antonio da Rho a Bartolomeo Bayguera: un resoconto dell'Itinerarium', in: *Libri e lettori a Brescia tra Medioevo ed età moderna. Atti della giornata di studi (Brescia, Università Cattolica, 16 maggio 2002)*, a cura di V. Grohovaz (Brescia) (*Monografie* 3), 155–81.
- , (2004) 'Episodi della fortuna di Catullo nel primo umanesimo: Francesco Petrarca, Coluccio Salutati e Domenico di Bandino', *Studi Petrarceschi, nuova ser.*, 17, 111–31.
- Giuliodori, G., (2001) 'La 3^a elegia della *Monobiblos* di Propertio. Note di lettura', *AFLM* 34, 195–218.
- Godman, P., (1998) *From Poliziano to Machiavelli. Florentine humanism in the high Renaissance* (Princeton).
- Goldberg, S. M., (1997) 'Melpomene's declamation (rhetoric and tragedy)', in: Dominik (1997), 166–81.
- Goold, G. P., (1965) 'Amatoria critica', *HSCPh* 69, 1–107.
- , (1967) 'Noctes Propertianae', *HSCPh* 71, 59–106.
- , (1971) Review of Smyth (1970), *Phoenix* 25, 294–95.
- , (1988) 'On editing Propertius', in: *Vir bonus discendi peritus. Studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday*, ed. N. Horsfall (BICS Suppl. 51) (London) 27–38.
- , (1989) 'Problems in editing Propertius', in: J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York) 97–119.
- , (1990) *Propertius. Elegies* (Cambridge Ma.).
- , (1992) 'Paralipomena Propertiana', *HSCPh* 94, 287–320.
- , (1999) *Propertius: Elegies* (Cambridge Ma./London, 2nd ed.).
- Gow, A. S. F.,/Page, D. L., (1965) (1968) *The Greek Anthology (Cambridge): Hellenistic Epigrams* (two vols.) (Cambridge 1965); *The Garland of Philip* (two vols.) (Cambridge 1968).
- Graevius, J. G., (1680) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius ex recensione Joannis Georgii Graevii* (Traiecti ad Rhenum).
- Grafton, A. T., (1983) *Joseph Justus Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship. I Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Oxford).
- Greene, E., (1995) 'Elegiac Woman: Fantasy, *Materia* and Male Desire in Propertius 1.3 and 1.11', *AJP* 116, 303–18.
- , (1998) *The Erotics of Domination. Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore/London) ('Chapter Three. Elegiac Woman. Fantasy, *Materia*, and Male Desire in Propertius' *Monobiblos*', pp. 37–66: reworked and expanded version of Greene 1995).
- Griffante, C., (1988/1989) 'Il catalogo della biblioteca a stampa di Pier Vettori', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Classe di scienze morali e lettere* 147, 371–534.
- Griffin, J., (1985) *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London).
- Grumach, E., (1949) *Goethe und die Antike*, 2 Bde. (Berlin).
- Grüner, A., (1993) 'Zur Topographie des Esquilin in der frühen Kaiserzeit: das Haus des Properz: Versuch einer Lokalisierung', *Boreas* 16, 39–55.
- Günther, H.-C., (1994) 'Tibullus ludens', *Eikasmos* 5, 251–69.
- , (1997a) *Quaestiones Propertianae* (Leiden/New York/Köln) (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 169) (Leiden).
- , (1997b) 'Properz und das Selbstzitat in der augusteischen Dichtung', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Jahrgang 1997*, Heft 2.
- , (1998) 'Römische Liebeslegie und hellenistische Dichtung', *Hellenika* 48, 7–27.
- , (2002) *Albius Tibullus, Elegien. Mit einer Einleitung zur römischen Liebeslegie und erklärenden Anmerkungen zum Text übersetzt von H.-C. Günther* (Würzburg).
- , (2003) Review of B. Georg (2001), *Gymnasium* 110, 187–91.

- Gutzwiller, K. J., (1998) *Poetic Garlands* (University of California).
- Habinek, Th. N., (1982) 'Propertius, Cynthia and the Lunar Year', *Latomus* 41, 589–596.
- Haffter, H., (1970) 'Das Gedichtbuch als dichterische Aussage—Überlegungen zu den Elegien des Properz', in: *Festschrift Karl Vretska* (Heidelberg) 53–67.
- Hall, J., (2004) 'Cicero and Quintilian on the oratorical use of hand gestures', *CQ* 54, 143–60.
- Hankey, A. T., (1957) 'The library of Domenico di Bandino', *Rinascimento* 8, 177–207.
- Hanslik, R., (1979) *Sexti Propertii elegiarum libri IV* (Leipzig).
- Harmon, D. P., (1974) 'Myth and Fantasy in Propertius 1.3', *TAPhA* 104, 151–165.
- Harrison, S. J., (1989) 'Augustus, the Poets, and the Spolia Opima', *CQ* 39, 408–414.
- , (1994) 'Drink, suspicion and comedy in Propertius 1.3', *PCPhS* 40, 18–26.
- Harrauer, H., (1973) *A Bibliography to Propertius* (Hildesheim).
- , (1981) 'Epigrammincipit auf einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v.Chr. P. Vindob. G. 40611 Ein Vorbericht', in: *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology, New York 24–31 July 1980* (Chico) 49–53.
- Haupt, M., (1876) Über Joseph Scaliger und die von Haase vorgeschlagene Umstellung tibullischer Versreihen, in: *Opuscula*, III, Leipzig 1876, 30–41.
- Havet, L., (1916) *Notes critiques sur Properce* (Paris).
- Hawley, R., (1995) 'Female characterisation in Greek declamation', in: Innes et al. (edd.), (1995) 255–67.
- Heath, M., (1993) 'STASIS-theory in Homeric commentary', *Mnemosyne* 46, 356–63.
- Heimreich, C., (1864–1867) *Symb. Philol. Bonnens. in hon. Fr. Ritschelii* (Leipzig) 674–79.
- Heinsius, N., (1742) *Nicolai Heinsii Adversariorum libri IV numquam antea editi. In quibus plurima veterum Auctorum, Poetarum praesertim, loca emendantur et illustrentur. Subjiciuntur eiusdem Notae ad Catullum et Propertium nunc primum productae, curante Petro Burmanno juniore* (Harlingae).
- Heinze, R., (1919) *Ovids elegische Erzählung*, *SB Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 71, S. 76–86 (1–130) = *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Darmst. 1960) 364–403.
- Helm, R., (1939) Review of Day (1938), *Philolog. Wochenschr.* 59, 1000.
- Henriksson, K.-E., (1956) *Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur* (Helsinki) (*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Ser. B, Tom. 102,1).
- Hering, W., (1972) 'Properz I, 3', *WS* 85 (N.F. 6), 45–78.
- , (1973) 'Die Monobiblos als Gedichtbuch', *ACD* 9, 69–75.
- Herrmann, L., (1951) *L'âge d'argent doré* (Paris).
- Hertzberg, G. A. B., (1843–45) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor, quaestionum Propertianarum libris tribus et commentariis illustravit G. A. B. Hertzberg, F-III* (Halis).
- Herwig-Hager, G., (1965) 'Goethes Properz-Begegnung. »Der Besuch« und Properz I 3', in: H. Flashar/K. Gaiser (edd.), *Synusia. Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt zum 15. März 1965* (Pfullingen) 429–53.
- Heyworth, S.J., (1985) Review of Fedeli (1984), *CR* 35, 281–84.
- , (1986a) *The Manuscripts of Propertius: Towards a Critical Edition* (Diss. Cambridge).
- , (1986b) 'Notes on Propertius, books III and IV', *CQ* 36, 199–211.
- , (1992) 'Propertius 2.13', *Mnemosyne* 45, 45–59.
- , (1994) 'Some Allusions to Callimachus in Latin Poetry', *MD* 33, 51–79.
- , (1995a) 'Dividing Poems', in: O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve (eds.), *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Spoleto) 117–148.
- , (1995b) 'Propertius: Division, Transmission, and the Editor's Task', in: R. Brock/A. J. Woodman (edd.), *Roman Comedy, Augustan Poetry, Historiography. Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8, 1995, Leeds (*ARC4* 33), 165–188.
- , (1999) 'Textual notes on Propertius 4,3; 4,4; 4,5', in: *Amor, Roma: Love & Latin Literature: eleven essays (and one poem) by former research students presented to E. J. Kenney on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. S. M. Braund/R. (G.) Mayer (Cambridge) 71–93.

- , 'Propertius, patronage and politics', *BICS* (forthcoming).
- Higham, T. F., (1958) 'Ovid and rhetoric', in: N. I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana* (Paris) 33–41.
- Hinds, S., (1983) 'Carmina Digna. Gallus P. Qasir Ibrim 6–7 Metamorphosed', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4, 43–54.
- , (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hodge, R. I. V./Buttimore, R. A., (1977) *The 'Monobiblos' of Propertius. An account of the first book of Propertius, consisting of a text, translation, and critical essay on each poem* (Cambridge) = *Propertius Elegies Book I. Text and Translation with a Critical Analysis of each poem* (Bristol 2002) (Classical Studies series).
- Hofmann, E., (1928) 'Die literarische Persönlichkeit des P. Terentius Varro Atacinus', *WS* 46, 159–176.
- Hollis, A. S., (1990) *Callimachus: Hecale* (Oxford).
- , (1996) 'Heroic Honours for Philetas', *ΣPE* 110, 56–62.
- Holzberg, N., (1990) *Die römische Liebeslegie. Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt).
- , (2001) *Die römische Liebeslegie: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed.).
- Hopkinson, N., (1988) *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge).
- Hornblower, S., (1994) 'Narratology and narrative techniques in Thucydides', in: idem (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 131–66.
- Horsfall, N., (1995) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden/New York/Köln).
- , (2003) *Virgil, Aeneid 11—a commentary* (Leiden and Boston).
- Hose, M., (1994) 'Die römische Liebeslegie und die griechische Literatur. Überlegungen zu POxy 3723', *Philologus* 138, 67–82.
- Housman, A. E., (ed.) (1903) *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (London).
- , (1972) *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*. Ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge).
- Hubbard, M., (1968) 'Propertiana', *CQ* 18, 315–19.
- , (1975) *Propertius* (London, repr. Bristol 2001).
- Hutchinson, G. O., (1984) 'Propertius and the Unity of the Book', *JRS* 74, 99–106.
- , (1988) *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).
- , (2002) 'The new Posidippus and Latin poetry', *ΣPE* 138, 1–10.
- Innes, D., Hine, H., Pelling, C., (1995) *Ethics and rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday* (Oxford).
- Iodice di Martino, M. G., (1986) 'La metafora 'del corpo' nelle opere retoriche di Cicerone', *BStudLat* 16, 22–30.
- Ites, M., (1908) *De Properti elegiis inter se conexis* (Diss. Göttingen, Bielefeld).
- Jachmann, G., (1935) 'Eine Elegie des Properz. Ein Überlieferungsschicksal', *RhM* 84, 193–240 = *Ausgewählte Schriften (Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 128)* (Königstein 1981) 363–410.
- , (1951) 'Eine Studie zu Properz', *FS F. Schulz*, Bd. 2 (Weimar) 179–87 = *Ausgewählte Schriften (Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 128)* (Königstein 1981) 411–19.
- , (1955) 'Zur Frage der Verswiederholung in der augusteischen Dichtung', in: *Studi in onore di U. E. Paoli* (Firenze) 414–21.
- , (1957) 'Versus Coae vestis', in: AA.VV., *Miscellanea properziana* (Assisi) 39–47.
- Jacoby, F., (1905) 'Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie', *RhM* 60, 38–105 (= *Kleine philologische Schriften II* (Berlin 1961) 65–121).
- , (1909–1910) 'Tibulls erste Elegie', *RhM* 64, 601–22; 65, 22–87 (= *Kleine philologische Schriften II* (Berlin 1961) 122–205).
- , (1914) 'Drei Gedichte des Properz', *RhM* 69, 393–413, 427–63 (= *Kleine Philologische Schriften II* (Berlin 1961) 216–65).
- , (1930) Review of Richmond (1928), *Gnomon* 6, 103–4.
- Jäger, Kl., (1967) *Zweigliedrige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare bei Properz und in Ovids Amores* (Diss. Tübingen).
- James, S. L., (2003) *Learned girls and male persuasion: gender and reading in Roman love elegy* (Berkeley).

- Jocelyn, H. D., (1986) 'Propertius and archaic Latin poetry', in: *Bimillenario della more di Propertio* (Assisi) 105–36.
- Jones, D., (1997) *Enjoinder and argument in Ovid's Remedia Amoris* (Stuttgart).
- Jucker, H., (1982) 'Apollo Palatinus und Apollo Actius auf augusteischen Münzen', *MH* 39, 82–100.
- Kambylis, A., (1965) *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Propertius und Ennius* (Heidelberg).
- Karrer, W., (1977) *Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche* (München).
- Kaser, M., (1934) 'Testimonium', *RE* V A.1, 1021–61.
- Kaufhold, Sh., (1997) 'Propertius 1.3: Cynthia Rescripted', *ICS* 22: 87–98.
- Keith, A. M., (1999) 'Slender verse: Roman elegy and ancient rhetorical theory', *Mnemosyne* 52, 41–62.
- Kenney, E. J., (1969) 'Ovid and the law', *JCS* 21, 243–63.
- , (1973) *The Classical Text* (Berkeley).
- , (1981) Review of Hanslik (1979), *CR* 31, 200–2.
- , (1983) 'Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility', *ICS* 8, 44–59.
- , (1999) 'Vt erat novator: Anomaly, Innovation and Genre in Ovid, Heroides 16–21', in: J. N. Adams, R. G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, *PBA* 93, 399–414.
- Kerkhecker, A., (1988) 'Zur Komposition des vierten Horazischen Odenbuchs', in: *Antike und Abendland (Beiträge zum Verständnis der Griechen und Römer und ihres Nachlebens)* 34, 124–43.
- Kershaw, A., (1994a) 'Four passages in Goold's Propertius', *Mnemosyne* 47, 516–17.
- , (1994b) 'Propertius 4.8.77f.', *MH* 51, 179–80.
- , (1998) 'Propertius 4.5, 19–20', *Latomus* 57 (1), 105–8.
- Keyser, P. T., (1992) 'Propertius' horoscope: a suggested birthdate', *CPh* 87, 328–34.
- Kienast, D., (1982) *Augustus. Princeps und Monarch* (Darmstadt).
- Kierdorf, W., (1980) *Laudatio funebris: Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede* (Meisenheim am Glan).
- , (1995) 'Properzens Actium-Elegie (4.6): künstlerische Bewältigung einer politischen Annäherung' in: *Affirmation und Kritik: zur politischen Funktion von Kunst und Literatur im Altertum*, ed. G. Binder/B. Effe. (Trier) (*Bochumer altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* 20) 165–184.
- King, J. K., (1975) 'Propertius' Programmatic Poetry and the Unity of the *Monobiblos*', *CJ* 71, 108–24.
- Kleinknecht, H., (1937) 'Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike' (Stuttgart and Berlin).
- Klingner, Fr., (1965) 'Properzens Elegie Qualis Thesea', Privatdruck 1965; reprinted in: Fr. Klingner, *Römische Geisteswelt. Essays zur lateinischen Literatur*. Mit einem Nachwort hg. v. K. Büchner, München (repr. Stuttgart 1979) 430–43.
- Klodt, C., (2003) 'Prozessparteien und politische Gegner als dramatis personae. Charakterstilisierung in Ciceros Reden', in: *Schröder and Schröder*, 35–106.
- Knoche, U., (1936) 'Zur Frage der Properzinterpolation', *RhM* 85, 8–63.
- , (1957) 'Gedanken zur Interpretation von Properzens Gedicht II 28', in: *AA.VV., Miscellanea properziana* (Assisi) 49–70.
- Knox, P. E., (1986) 'Three naughty girls (Prop. 2.28.9–12)', *Phoenix* 40, 195–97.
- , (1995) *Ovid: Heroides. Select Epistles* (Cambridge).
- , (2005), 'Milestones in the Career of Tibullus', *CQ* 55 (2005) 204–16.
- Komp, M., (1988) *Absage an Cynthia. Das Liebesthema beim späten Properz* (Frankfurt).
- Kontoleon, N. M., 1952 (1954) 'Νέαι ἐπιγραφὰι περὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἐκ Πάρου', *Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς* 32–95.
- , (1956) 'Zu den neuen Archilochosinschriften', *Philol.* 100, 29–39.
- Koster, S., (1980) *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Meisenheim am Glan).
- Krasser, H., (1995) *Horazische Denkfiguren, Theophilie und Theophanie als Medium der poetischen Selbstdarstellung des Odendichters (Hypomnemata 106)* (Göttingen).

- Kroll, W., (1924) *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).
- Kuinoel, Ch. Th., (1805) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina rec., illustr. Ch. Th. Kuinoel*, I, II (Leipzig).
- Kytzler, B., (1993) 'Abschied von Rom', in: B. Kytzler (ed.), *Rom als Idee* (Darmstadt) 298–323.
- Lachmann, C., (1816) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina emendavit et adnotavit C. Lachmann* (Leipzig).
- Laigneau, S., (1999) *La femme et l'amour chez Catulle et les élégiaques augustéens* (Bruxelles).
- Landgraf, G., (1914) *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- La Penna, A., (1951) *Properzio. Saggio critico* (Firenze).
- , (1977) *L'Integrazione difficile. Un profilo di Properzio* (Torino).
- , (1982) Review of Hanslik (1979), *Gnomon* 54, 515–23.
- , (1988) Review of Fedeli (1984), *Gnomon* 60, 25–32.
- Latte, K., (1960) *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München).
- Leary, T. J., (1996) *Martial. Book XIV. The Apophoreta. Text with introduction and commentary* (London).
- Lefèvre, E., (1966) *Propertius ludibundus* (Heidelberg).
- , (1977) 'L'unità dell'elegia properziana', in: M. Bigaroni/F. Santucci (edd.), *Colloquium Propertianum. Assisi, 26–28 marzo 1976. Atti* (Assisi) 25–51.
- , (1989) *Das Bild-Programm des Apollo-Tempels auf dem Palatin* (Konstanz).
- Leo, F., (1880) 'Vindiciae Propertianae', *RhM* 35, 431–47.
- , (1898) 'Anzeige von Propertius' Elegien erkl. von M. Rothstein', *GGA*, 722–50.
- , (1900) 'Elegie und Komödie', *RhM* 55, 604–11.
- , (1912) *Plautinische Forschungen* (Berlin).
- Liberman, G., (2002) 'Remarques sur le premier livre des *Élégies* de Propertius', *RPh* 76, [2003], 49–100.
- Lieberg, G., (1961) 'L'elegia I 3 di Properzio', *GIF* 14, 308–26.
- , (1962) *Puella divina. Die Gestalt der göttlichen Geliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung* (Amsterdam).
- , (1963) 'Die Muse des Propertius und seine Dichterweihe', *Philologus* 107, 116–29, 263–70.
- Liedberg, G., (1998) 'De Propertio IV, 3, 49–50', *RhM* 141, 362–67.
- Lightfoot, J. L., (1999) *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford).
- Lilja, S., (1965) *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women* (*Annales Academiae Fennicae*) (Helsinki).
- Lingenberg, W., (2003) *Das 1. Buch der Heroidenbriefe. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen* (Paderborn etc.).
- Loehr, J., (1996) *Die Mehrfacherklärungen Ovids in der Tradition der aitiologischen Dichtung* (Leipzig/Stuttgart).
- Lucas, H., (1900) 'Recusatio', *Festschrift für Johannes Vahlen* (Berlin) 317–33.
- Luck, G., (1967) 'Goethes "Römische Elegien" und die augusteische Liebeselegie', *arcadia* 2, 173–95.
- , (1969) *The Latin Love Elegy* (London, 2nd ed.).
- , (1962) *Hexen und Zauberei in der römischen Dichtung* (Zürich).
- Lupattelli, A., (1996) 'Il commento properziano di Antonio Volsco', in: AA.VV., *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann* (Assisi) 381–93.
- Luther, A., (2003) 'Ein *Terminus ante quem* für die *Monobiblos* des Propertius', *Latomus* 62, 801–06.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M., (1970) 'Propertius and Cynthia: Elegy 1. 3', *PCPhS* 196 (n.s. 16), 60–78.
- , (1978a) *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge).
- , (1978b) 'The neoteric poets', *CQ* 28, 167–87.
- , (1979) 'Seruitium amoris', *CQ* 29, 117–30.

- , (1980) *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford).
- , (1998a) 'Propertius 2.10 and 11 and the Structure of Books "2a" and "2b"', *JRS* 88, 21–36.
- , (1998b) 'Propertius and Tibullus: early exchanges', *CQ* 48, 519–44 ('Lyne 1998b').
- , (1998c) 'Introductory Poems in Propertius 1.1 and 2.12', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 44, 158–81 ('Lyne 1998a').
- , (1998d) 'Love and Death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius, and Others', *CQ* 48, 200–12.
- Maas, P., (1973) 'Zum griechischen Feuerruf', in: W. Buchwald (ed.), Paul Maas, *Kleine Schriften* (Munich) 58–59.
- Macleod, C. W., (1974) 'A use of myth in ancient poetry', *CQ* 24, 82–93.
- , (1983) *Collected Essays* (Oxford).
- Maddalo, S., (1991) 'I manoscritti Mazzatosta', in: *Cultura umanistica a Viterbo per il V centenario della stampa a Viterbo (1488–1988)*, 12 novembre 1988 (Viterbo) 47–86.
- Mader, G., (1990) 'The Apollo similes at Propertius 4, 6, 31–36', *Hermes* 118, 325–34.
- , (1989) 'Propertius 4,6,45–52: Poetry and Propaganda', *WS* 102, 141–47.
- , (1991) 'Changing forms: an addendum to Propertius 4.2, 21–48', *WS* 104, 131–47.
- Magnelli, E., (1999) 'POxy. 3723.1–2. Il mito di Arginno?', *ZPE* 125, 87–90.
- Maier, I., (1965) *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* (Genève) (*Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 81).
- Maltby R., (1991) *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds).
- , (2002) *Tibullus: Elegies* (Cambridge).
- Manzoni, G. E., (1995) *Foroiulienensis poeta. Vita e poesia di Cornelio Gallo* (Milan).
- Marchese, R. R., (1995) 'Posito amore lapis: l'amore et la morte come prospettiva etiche nell' elegia di Propertio', *Pan* 13, 79–89.
- Marconi, G., (1998) *Poesie Latine di A. Rimbaud* (Pisa-Rome).
- Martelli, M., (1985) 'Le elegie di Naldo Naldi', in: *Tradizione classica e letteratura umanistica. Per A. Perosa*, a cura di R. Cardini et al., I (Roma) (*Humanistica* 3), 307–32.
- Martellotti, G., (1983) *Scritti petrarcheschi*, a cura di M. Feo/S. Rizzo (Padova) (*Studi sul Petrarca* 16), 388–95.
- Mastroiaco, C., (1998) 'Il POxy 3723 per l'origine dell'elegia romana', *RCCM* 40, 215–27.
- Matthews, V. J., (1996) *Antimachus of Colophon* (Leiden).
- Mayer, R. G., (2001) *Tacitus: Dialogus de Oratoribus* (Cambridge).
- McKeown, J., (1989) *Ovid: Amores. Text, prolegomena and commentary. Vol. II: A Commentary on Book One* (Leeds).
- McNamee, K., (1993) 'Propertius, Poetry, and Love', in: M. DeForest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game. Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda) 215–48.
- McParland, E. H., (1970) 'Propertius 4.9', *TAPA* 101, 349–55.
- Meissler, H. J., (1987) *Goethe und Properz* (Bochum).
- Mensching, E., (1926) *Das heilige Schweigen* (Giessen).
- Merklin, H., (1968) 'Arethusa und Lycotas', *Hermes* 96, 461–94.
- Meyers, K. S., (1996) 'The poet and the procuress: the lena in Latin love elegy', *JRS* 86, 1–21.
- Michelfeit, J., (1969) 'Das augusteische Gedichtbuch', *RhM* 112, 347–70.
- Miller, J. F., (1986) 'Disclaiming divine inspiration. A programmatic pattern', *WS* 20, 151–64.
- , (2002) *Latin Erotic Elegy. An anthology and reader. Edited with an introduction and commentary* (London/New York).
- , (2004) *Subjecting Verses. Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real* (Princeton/Oxford).

- Mitchell, R.N., (1985) 'Propertius on poetry and poets: tradition and the individual erotic talent', *Ramus* 14, 46–58.
- Monti Sabia, L., (1996) 'La mano di Giovanni Pontano in due Livii della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli (Mss. ex Vind. lat. 33 e IV C 20)', *IMU* 39, 171–208.
- Morelli, A. M., (1985) 'Rassegna sul nuovo Gallo', in: V. Tandoi (ed.), *Disiecti Membra Poetae. Studi di poesia latina in frammenti*. Vol. II (Foggia) 140–83.
- , (1994) 'Sul papiro di Ossirinco LIV 3723. Considerazioni sui caratteri dell'elegia erotica ellenistica alla luce dei nuovi ritrovamenti papiracei', *RFIC* 122, 385–421.
- Morgan J. D., (1986) 'Cruces Propertianae', *CQ* 36, 182–98.
- Mueller, L., (1870) *Sex. Propertii Elegiae* (Leipzig).
- Müller, C. W., (1995) 'Imaginationen des Todes in den Elegien des Tibull und Properz', *AA* 41, 132–41.
- , (1995) 'Imaginationen des Todes in den Elegien des Tibull und Properz', *AG&A* 41, 132–47.
- , (1997) *Philoktet: Beiträge zur Wiedergewinnung einer Tragödie des Euripides aus der Geschichte ihrer Rezeption* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- , (2000) *Euripides: Philoktet: Testimonien und Fragmente* (Berlin/New York).
- Munk Olsen, B., (1985) (1987) (1989) *L'étude des auteurs classiques aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, II (Paris), Éd. du C.N.R.S., 1985, 281–82; Id., *L'étude des auteurs classiques aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, III/1. *Les classiques dans le bibliothèques médiévales* (Paris), CNRS Editions, 1987; III/2. *Addenda et corrigenda* (Paris), CNRS Editions, 1989.
- Murgatroyd, P., (1975) 'Militia amoris in the Roman elegists', *Latomus* 34, 59–79
- (1981), 'Seruitium amoris and the Roman elegists', *Latomus* 90, 589–606.
- , (1995) 'The Sea of Love', *CQ* 45, 9–25.
- , (1994) *Albius Tibullus: Elegies II* (Oxford).
- Murgia, C. E., (2000) 'The Division of Propertius 2', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 45, 147–242.
- Mutschler, F.-H., (1996) 'Hercules im Hain: Überlegungen zur Properzelegie 4, 9', in: *Worte, Bilder, Töne: Studien zur Antike und Antikerezeption: Bernhard Kytzler zu ehren*, ed. R. Faber/B. Seidensticker (Würzburg) 115–128.
- Navarro Antolin, F., (1997) 'El suicido como motivo literario en los elegiacos latinos', *Emerita* 65, 41–55.
- Nelis, D., (2001) *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Leeds).
- Nethercut, W. R., (1983) 'Recent Scholarship on Propertius', in: *ANRW* II.30.3 (Berlin/New York) 1813–1857.
- Neumann, E., (1925) *De cottidiani sermonis apud Propertium proprietatibus. Accedit mantissa de codicibus D et V* (Diss. Königsberg).
- Neumeister, K., (1983) *Die Überwindung der elegischen Liebe bei Properz (Buch I–III)*, (Frankfurt a.M./Bern) (*Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 7).
- Newman, J. K./Newman, F. S., (1984) *Pindar's Art. Its Tradition and Aims* (Hildesheim).
- , (2004) 'Semitic Aspects of the Greco-Roman Pastoral', *Studia Palaeophilologica*, ed. S. M. Bay (Champaign, Illinois) 53–69.
- Newman, J. K., (1967) *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Brussels).
- , (1975) 'Pushkin and Horace. Remarks on 'Exegi monumentum' and 'Pamyatnik'', *Neohelicon* 1 (Budapest) 331–42.
- , (1985) 'Pindar and Callimachus', *ICS* 10, 169–89.
- , (1986) *The Classical Epic Tradition* (Madison).
- , (1990) *Roman Catullus* (Hildesheim).
- , (1997) *Augustan Propertius. The Recapitulation of a Genre* (Hildesheim).
- , (1998) 'Saturno Rege: Themes of the Golden Age in Tibullus and Other Augustan Poets', in: Radke (1998) 225–46.
- , (2001) 'Altae Romae', *ICS* 26, 131–32.
- , (2002–2003) 'Philologists or Philosophers?' *ICS* 27–28, 197–212.

- , (2003) 'Ovid's Epic, Picasso's Art', *Latomus* 62, 362–72.
- Nicholson, N., (1988–1989) 'Bodies without names, names without bodies: Propertius 1.21–22', *CJ* 94, 143–61.
- , (1999) 'Bodies without Names, Names without Bodies: Propertius 1.21–22', *CJ* 94, 143–61.
- Nisbet, R. G. M./Hubbard, M., (1970) *A Commentary on Horace Odes 1* (Oxford).
- , (1978) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Vol. II: Book II* (Oxford).
- Noonan, J. D., (1991) 'Propertius I.3.3–4: Andromeda Is Missing', *CJ* 86, 330–36.
- O'Hara, J. J., (1989) 'The New Gallus and the *Alternae Voces* of Propertius 1.10.10.', *CQ* 39, 561–62.
- Obbink, D. (ed.), (1995) *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (Oxford).
- O'Neill, K., (1998–1999) 'Symbolism and sympathetic magic in Propertius 4.5', *CJ* 94, 49–80.
- Opelt, I., (1982) 'Schimpfwörter bei Claudian', *Glotta* 60, 130–35.
- Otis, B., (1965) 'Propertius' Single Book', *HSPH* 70, 1–44.
- Otón Sobrino, E., (1995) 'La palabra en el umbral', *CFC(L)* 8, 67–77.
- Otto, A., (1890) *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig) (repr. Hildesheim 1965).
- Palm, J., (1965–1966) *Bemerkungen zur Ekphrasen in der griechischen Literatur* (Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, Arsbok) (Stockholm).
- Palmer, A., (1880) *Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV, recensuit A. Palmer* (Londinii-Dublino).
- Palmer, A./Ellis, R., (1876) 'Scaliger's liber Cujacianus of Propertius, Catullus and Tibullus', *Hermathena* 2, 124–58.
- Papaioannou, S., (2005), review of B. Beorg 2001, *GB* 24, 322–25.
- Papanghelis, Th. D., (1987) *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge).
- Paparelli, G., (1987) 'Properzio nella poesia giovanile di Enea Silvio Piccolomini', in: *Properzio nella letteratura italiana. Atti del Convegno Nazionale (Assisi, 15–17 novembre 1985)*, a cura di S. Pasquazi (Roma) 65–70.
- Parsons, P. J., (1988) 'Eine neugefundene griechische Liebeslegie', *MH* 45, 65–74.
- Pascucci, G., (1986) 'Il Callimachismo stilistico di Properzio', in: *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi properziani, Roma-Assisi 21–26 maggio 1985* (Assisi), 199–222.
- Pedrali, M., (2002) *Novo, grande, coperto e ferrato. Gli inventari di biblioteca e la cultura a Milano nel Quattrocento* (Milano) (*Bibliotheca erudita* 19).
- Petersmann, G., (1978) 'Properz I 3', *Latomus* 37, 953–59.
- , (1980) *Themenführung und Motiventfaltung in der Monobiblos des Properz* (Horn/Graz) (*GB Suppl.* 1).
- , (1983) 'Cornelius Gallus und der Papyrus von Qasr Ibrim', in: *ANRW* II.30.3 (Berlin/New York) 1649–1655.
- Petoletti, M., (2004) 'Le postille del Petrarca a Servio', in: *Francesco Petrarca. Manoscritti e libri a stampa della Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, a cura di M. Ballarini/G. Frasso/C. Monti (Milano) 43–50.
- Pezzarossa, F., (2000 [ma 2001]) "'Canon est litterarum". I libri di Filippo Beroaldo', in: *Libri, lettori e biblioteche dell'Italia medievale (secoli IX–XV). Fonti, testi, utilizzazione del libro. / Livres, lecteurs et bibliothèques de l'Italie médiévale (IX^e–XV^e siècles). Sources, textes et usages. Actes de la Table ronde italo-française (Rome, 7–8 mars 1997) Atti della Tavola rotonda italo-francese (Roma, 7–8 marzo 1997)*, a cura di G. Lombardi e D. Nebbiai-Dalla Guardia (Paris-Roma) CNRS Editions (*Documents, Études et Répertoires* 64), 301–48.
- Phillimore, J. S. (ed.), (1901) *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford).
- Pichon, R., (1991) *Index verborum amatorium*, (repr. Hildesheim) (Paris 1902, 2nd ed.)
- Pilliger, H. E., (1969) 'Some Callimachean Influences on Propertius, Book 4', *HSCP* 73, 171–199.

- Pinotti, P., (1983) 'Properzio e Vertumno: Anticonformismo e Restaurazione Augustea', in: *Colloquium Properzianum (tertium), Assisi, 29–31 maggio 1981* (Assisi 1983) 75–96
- Platnauer, M., (1951) *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge).
- Pontano, G., (1943) *I dialoghi*, a cura di C. Previtera (Firenze).
- Port, W., (1926) 'Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit', *Philologus* 81, 280–308, 427–468
- Postgate, J. P., (1894) *Sexti Propertii carmina recognovit J. P. Postgate* (London).
- Pound, E., (1950) *The letters of Ezra Pound*. Ed. by D. D. Paige (New York).
- , (1954) *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*. Ed. by T. S. Eliot (London/New York).
- Powell, J. U., (1925) *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford).
- Prescott, H. W., (1940) review of Day (1938), *CPh* 35, 102–3.
- Puelma, M., (1982) 'Die Aetien des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie' I and II', *MH* 39, 221–46, 285–304
- , (1995) *Labor et Lima. Kleine Schriften und Nachträge* (Basel)
- , (1996) 'Epigramma—epigrama: Aspekte einer Wortgeschichte', *MH* 53, 123–39
- , (1997) 'Epigramma. Osservazioni sulla storia di un termine greco-latino', *Maia* n.s. 2, 189–213.
- Purcell, N., (1999) 'Does Caesar mime?', in: B. Bergmann, C. Kondoleon (edd.), *The art of ancient spectacle* (New Haven and London) 181–93.
- Putnam, M. C. J., (1986) *Artifices of Eternity* (*Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* 43) (Ithaca).
- Quadlbauer, F., (1958) 'Die genera dicendi bis Plinius d.J.', *WS* 71, 55–111.
- Radicke, J., (1999) Review of Günther (1997b), *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeige* 251, 168–80.
- Radke, A. E. (ed.), (1998) *Candide Iudex. Beiträge zur augusteischen Dichtung. Festschrift für W. Wimmel zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart).
- Rambaux, Cl., (2001b) *Properce ou les difficultés de l'émancipation féminine* (Bruxelles) (*Collection Latomus*, vol. 261) ('Rambaux 2001b').
- , (2001a) review of B. Georg 2001, *REL* 79, 302–3.
- Rati, G., (1987) 'Properzio e i lirici del Cinquecento', in: *Properzio nella letteratura italiana. Atti del Convegno Nazionale (Assisi, 15–17 novembre 1985)*, a cura di S. Pasquazi (Roma) 117–30.
- Regoliosi, M., (1993) *Nel Cantiere del Valla. Elaborazione e montaggio delle 'Elegantie'* (Firenze) (*Humanistica* 13).
- Reitzenstein, E., (1931) 'Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos', in: E. Fraenkel et al. (edd.) *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein* (Leipzig and Berlin) 23–69.
- , (1936) *Wirklichkeit und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz* (*Philologus Suppl.* 39) (Leipzig)
- , (1969) 'Die Cornelia-Elegie des Properz (IV 11)', *RhM* 112, 126–45.
- , (1970) *Über die Elegie des Propertius auf den Tod der Cornelia* (Mainz).
- Reitzenstein, R., (1912) 'Noch einmal Tibulls erste Elegie', *Hermes* 47, 60–116.
- Restani, M., (1966) 'I commenti di Mureto e di Scaligero', in: AA.VV., *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann* (Assisi) 177–88.
- Reynolds, L. J./Wilson, N., (1991) *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford, 3rd ed.)
- Richardson, B., (1976) 'Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus', *IMU* 19, 277–89.
- Richardson, L., (1977) *Propertius. Elegies I–IV. Edited, with introduction and commentary* (Norman).
- Richmond, O. L., (1928) *Sex Propertii quae supersunt opera edidit novoque apparatu critico instruxit O. L. Richmond* (Cambridge).
- Rico, F., (1998) *Il sogno dell'umanesimo. Da Petrarca a Erasmo* (Torino) [tit. orig.: *El sueño del humanismo. De Petrarca a Erasmo*, Madrid 1993].
- Riedel, V., (2000) *Antikerezeption in der deutschen Literatur vom Renaissance-Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart/Weimar).
- Riedweg, C., (2000) 'Der Tragödiendichter als Rhetor? Redestrategien in Euripides' Hekabe und ihr Verhältnis zur zeitgenössischen Rhetoriktheorie', *RhM* 143, 1–32
- Rinuccini, A., (1953) *Lettere e orazioni*, a cura di V. R. Giustiniani (Firenze) (*Nuova collezione di testi umanistici inediti o rari* 9).

- Rizzo, S., (1986) 'Il latino nell'umanesimo', in: *Letteratura italiana, V: Le questioni* (Torino) 379–408.
- , (1991) in *Codici latini del Petrarca nelle biblioteche fiorentine, Mostra 19 maggio–30 giugno 1991*, Catalogo a cura di M. Feo (Firenze) 16–19.
- , (2002) *Ricerche sul latino umanistico*, I (Roma) (*Storia e letteratura* 231).
- Rohde, E., (1914) *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig, 3rd ed.).
- Roller, M. B., (2001) 'Color', in: *Sloane* (2001), 115–19.
- de Romilly, J., (1975) *Magic and rhetoric in ancient Greece* (Cambridge, Ma./London).
- Rose, S., (2001) *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 156 (Leipzig).
- Rosen, R. M./J. Farrell, (1986) 'Acontius, Milanion, and Gallus: Vergil *Ecl.* 10.52–61', *TAPA* 116, 241–54.
- Ross, D. O., (1969) *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- , (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge).
- Rothstein, M., (1898) *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*. Erklärt von M. Rothstein, I–II, (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1920/1924).
- , (1900) 'Nachträgliches zu Propertius', *Philologus* 59, 441–65.
- Rothwell, K. S., (1996) 'Propertius on the site of Rome', *Latomus* 55, 829–54.
- Rouse, R. H., (1973) 'Manuscripts belonging to Richard de Fournival', *RHT* 3, 253–69.
- , (1979) 'Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans', *Viator* 10, 131–60.
- Rozzo, U., (2000 [ma 2001]) 'Il libro a stampa nelle biblioteche friulane di fine Quattrocento (con alcune premesse metodologiche)', in: *Libri, lettori e biblioteche dell'Italia medievale (secoli IX–XV). Fonti, testi, utilizzazione del libro. / Livres, lecteurs et bibliothèques de l'Italie médiévale (IX–XV siècles). Sources, textes et usages. Actes de la Table ronde italo-française (Rome, 7–8 mars 1997) Atti della Tavola rotonda italo-francese (Roma, 7–8 marzo 1997)*, a cura di G. Lombardi e D. Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda (Paris-Roma) CNRS Editions (*Documents, Études et Répertoires* 64).
- Rüdiger, H., (1978) 'Goethes "Römische Elegien" und die antike Tradition', *Goethe Jahrbuch* 95, 175–98.
- Rühl, M., (2000) *Die Darstellung von Gefühlsentwicklungen in den Elegien des Propertius* (Diss. Frankfurt, Göttingen).
- Russell, D. A./Wilson, N. G. (edd.), (1981) *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford).
- Russell, D. A., (2001) *Quintilian: The Orator's Education* (Cambridge, Ma./London).
- Santoro, M., (1987) 'Propertius e la poesia volgare nel Quattrocento', in: *Propertius nella letteratura italiana. Atti del Convegno Nazionale (Assisi, 15–17 novembre 1985)*, a cura di S. Pasquazi (Roma) 71–115.
- Savino, G., (1976) 'La libreria di Sozomeno da Pistoia', *Rinascimento* ser. II, 16, 159–72.
- Sbordone, F., (1941) 'Il ciclo italico di Eracle (III)', *Athen.* 29, 149–80.
- Scaliger, I., (1577) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius. I. Scaliger recensuit. Eiusdem in eosdem castigationum liber* (Parisiis).
- Schindel, U., (1980) *Die Invektive gegen Cicero und die Theorie der Tadelrede, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 77–92.
- Schmalzriedt, E., (1980) 'Sophokles und die Rhetorik', *Rhetorik* 1, 89–110.
- Schmidt, J., (1985) *Die Geschichte des Genie-Gedankens in der deutschen Literatur, Philosophie und Politik 1750–1945*, Bd. 1 (Darmstadt).
- Schmitz, T.A., (2000) 'Plausibility in the Greek orators', *AJPh* 121, 47–77.
- Schönbeck, G., (1962) *Der Locus Amoenus von Homer bis Horaz* (Diss. Heidelberg).
- Schönberger, O. (ed.), (1968) *Philostratos, Die Bilder* (München).
- Schrader, J., (1776) *Liber emendationum* (Leeuwarden).
- Schröder, B.-J. and J.-P., (2003) *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* (Munich/Leipzig).

- Schulz-Vanheyden, E., (1969) *Properz und das griechische Epigramm* (Diss. Münster).
- Schumacher, L., (1982) *Servus Index* (Wiesbaden).
- Schuster, M., (1922) 'Zum Dativ bei Properz', *Berlin. Philol. Woch.* 1922, coll. 310–12.
- Scodel, R., (1999–2000) 'Verbal performance and Euripidean rhetoric', *ICS* 24–25, 129–44.
- Selden, D., (1992) 'Caveat lector: Catullus and the rhetoric of performance', in: R. Hexter, D. Selden (edd.), *Innovations in Antiquity* (New York and London) 461–512.
- Sellar, W. Y., (1891) *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. Horace and the Elegiac Poets* (Oxford).
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., (1945) 'Propertiana', *CQ* 39, 119–22.
- , (1947) 'Interpretations of Propertius', *CQ* 41, 89–92.
- , (1949) 'Propertiana', *CQ* 43, 22–29.
- , (1952–1953) 'Some Recent Experiments in Propertian Criticism', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* N.S. 2, 9–20.
- , (1956) *Propertiana* (Cambridge).
- , (1993) Review of Goold (1990), *Gnomon* 65, 454.
- Sharrock, A., (2000) 'Constructing Characters in Propertius', *Arethusa* 33, 263–84.
- Sinclair, P., (1993) 'The sententia in Rhetorica ad Herennium: a study in the sociology of rhetoric', *AJPh* 114, 561–80.
- Skutsch, F., (1901) *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig).
- , (1906) *Gallus und Vergil. Aus Vergils Frühzeit. Zweiter Teil* (Leipzig/Berlin).
- Skutsch, O., (1963) 'The Structure of the Propertian *Monobiblos*', *CPh* 58, 238–239
- , (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford).
- Sloane, T. O., (2001) *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* (Oxford).
- Smyth, W. R., (1970) *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*. Mnemosyne Supplement 12 (Leiden).
- Snell, B., (1975⁴) *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Göttingen).
- Solmsen, F., (1961) 'Propertius and his Literary Relations with Tibullus and Vergil', *Philologus* 105, 271–89.
- Spanoudakis, K., (2002) *Philias of Cos* (Leiden).
- , (2004) 'Adesp. Pap. Eleg. SH 964: Parthenius?', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 50, 37–41.
- Spies, A., (1930) *Militat omnis amans. Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik* (Diss. Tübingen).
- Stahl, H.-P., (2002) review of B. Georg 2001, *BMCRev* 2002.08.34.
- , (1985) *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'. Individual and State under Augustus* (Berkeley etc.)
- Steidle, W., (1962) 'Das Motiv der Lebenswahl bei Tibull und Properz', *WS* 75, 100–40.
- Stok, F., (1986) 'Properzio ed il "morir d'amore"', in: *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio*, 335–7 (Assisi).
- Strazulla, M. J., (1985) *Assisi Romana* (Assisi).
- Stroh, W., (1971) *Die römische Liebeslegie als werbende Dichtung* (Amsterdam).
- , (1983) 'Die Ursprünge der römischen Liebeslegie. Ein altes Problem im Licht eines neuen Fundes', *Poetica* 15, 205–46.
- , (2003) 'Declamatio', in: *Schröder and Schröder*, 5–34.
- Sullivan, J. P., (1964) *Ezra Pound and Sextus Propertius. A Study in Creative Translation* (Austin).
- , (1967) 'Traduttore, Traditore?', in: E. Hesse, *Ezra Pound. 22 Versuche über einen Dichter* (Frankfurt/M./Bonn) 128–146.
- , (1976) *Propertius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge).
- Sumi, G. S., (2002) 'Impersonating the dead: mimes at Roman funerals', *AJPh* 123, 559–85.
- Summers, A., (1995) *Philodemus Περὶ ποιημάτων and Horace's Ars Poetica. Adapting Alexandrian Aesthetics to Epicurean and Roman Traditions* (Diss. Urbana, Illinois).
- Syme, R., (1978) *History in Ovid* (Oxford).

- Syndikus, H. P., (1998) 'Horaz und die elegischen Dichter', in: Radke (1998) 375–98.
 —, (2001) *Catull. Eine Interpretation, Bd. 1–3* (Darmstadt, 3rd ed.).
- Szádéczky-Kardoss, S., (1959) *Testimonia de Minnemi Vita et Carminibus (Acta Universitatis Szegedinensis, Sectio Antiqua 1959, Minora Opera ad studium antiquitatis pertinentia 2)* (Szeged).
- Tarrant, R. J., (1983) 's.v. Propertius', in: *Texts and transmission. A survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford) 324–26.
 —, (1987) 'Towards a Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry', *TAPhA* 117, 281–98.
 —, (1989) 'The Reader as Author: Collaborative Interpolation in Latin Poetry', in: J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York) 1221–162.
 —, (1995) 'Ovid and the failure of rhetoric', in: Innes et al. (1995) 63–74.
 —, (2002) 'Ovid and ancient literary history', in: P. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge) 13–33.
- Tateo, F., (1987) 'Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento', in: *Properzio nella letteratura italiana. Atti del Convegno Nazionale (Assisi, 15–17 novembre 1985)*, a cura di S. Pasquazi (Roma) 41–64.
 —, (1996) 'Le Elegie del Poliziano e la fortuna di Properzio nella cerchia medicea', in: *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Assisi, 28–30 ottobre 1994*, a cura di G. Catanzaro e F. Santucci, Assisi, Accademia properziana del Subasio (*Centro studi poesia latina in distici elegiaci* 4), 153–67.
 —, (1998) 'Le elegie "properziane" di Giovannantonio Campano', in: *A confronto con Properzio (da Petrarca a Pound). Atti del Convegno internazionale, Assisi, 17–19 maggio 1996*, a cura di G. Catanzaro e F. Santucci, Assisi, Accademia properziana del Subasio (*Centro studi poesia latina in distici elegiaci* 5) 125–40.
- Tatham, G., (2000) "'Just as Ariadne lay . . .': images of sleep in Propertius 1.3", *Scholía* 9, 43–53.
- Tedeschi, A., (1990) "'Così non può continuare" ovvero la separazione', in: S. Alfonsi/G. Cipriani/P. Fedeli/I. Mazzini/A. Tedeschi, *Il poeta elegiaco e il viaggio d'amore* (Bari) 157–208.
- Thomas, E., (1964) 'Variations on a military theme in Ovid's *Amores*', *G&R* 11, 151–64.
- Thomas, R. F., (1979) 'Theocritus, Calvus, and *Eclogue* 6', *CPh* 74, 337–39 (= Thomas (1999) 297–299).
 —, (1981) 'Cinna, Calvus and the *Ciris*', *CQ* 31, 371–374 (= Thomas (1999) 300–5).
 —, (1983) 'Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry', *CQ* 33, 92–113 (= Thomas (1999) 68–100).
 —, (1986) 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCPh* 90, 171–98 (= Thomas (1999) 114–41).
 —, (1996) 'Genre through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius', *Hellenistica Groningana* 2, 22–46 (= Thomas (1999) 246–66).
 —, (1999) *Reading Virgil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor).
- Timpanaro, S., (1981) *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann* (Padova, 2nd ed.).
- Todorov, T. (ed.), (1965) *Théorie de la littérature* (Paris).
- Toohy, P., (1997) 'Eros and eloquence: modes of amatory persuasion in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*', in: Dominik (1997) 198–211.
- Tordeur, P., (1988) 'Structures symétriques chez Properce', *Latomus* 47, 105–116.
- Tränkle, H., (1960) *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache (Hermes Einzelschriften 15)* (Wiesbaden).
 —, (1965) Review of P. J. Enk (ed.), *Sex. Properti Elegiarum liber secundus, Gnomon* 37, 692–701.
 —, (1967) 'Neoterische Kleinigkeiten', *MH* 24, 87–103.

- , (1986) 'Die Sprache des Properz und die stilistischen Tendenzen der augusteischen Dichtung', in: *Bimillenario della morte di Propertio. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi properziani, Roma-Assisi 21–26 maggio 1985* (Assisi) 155–73.
- Traube, L., (1911) *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, II (München).
- Treggiari, S. M., (1991) *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the times of Cicero to the times of Ulpian* (Oxford).
- Treu, M., (1959) *Archilochos* (Munich).
- Tristano, C., (1988) *La biblioteca di un umanista calabrese: Aulo Giano Parrasio* (Manziana-Roma, Vecchiarelli).
- Uhlmann, G., (1909) *De Sex. Propertii genere dicendi* (Diss. Münster).
- Ullman, B. L., (1928) *Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri XVIII*, ed. B. L. Ullman (Roma) (*Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome* 6).
- , (1973) 'Studies in the Italian Renaissance', (Roma) (*Storia e letteratura* 51).
- Usener, H., (1901) 'Italische Volksjustiz', *RhM* 56, 1–28.
- van Berchem, D., (1948) 'Cynthia ou la carrière contrariée. Essai sur la condition sociale des poètes latins', *MH* 5, 137–54.
- van der Paardt, R. Th., (1985) 'Propertius I,3: De slaap als medeminnaar', *Lampas* 18, 190–202.
- Veyne, P., (1983) *L'Élegie érotique romaine* (Paris).
- , (1988) *Roman Erotic Elegy. Love, Poetry, and the West*. Translated by D. Pellauer (Chicago).
- Viarre, S., (2005) *Properce. Elégies. Texte établi, traduit et commenté par S. Viarre* (Paris).
- Villa, C., (1982) 'I programmi scolastici', in: *Dall'eremo al cenobio. La civiltà monastica in Italia dalle origini all'età di Dante* (Milano) 292–320.
- , (1992) 'Il lessico della stilistica fra XI e XIII sec.', in: *Vocabulaire des écoles et des méthodes d'enseignement au moyen âge. Actes du colloque, Rome, 21–22 octobre 1989*, éd. par O. Weijers (Turnhout) (*CIVICIMA. Etudes sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du moyen âge* 5), 42–59.
- , (1992) 'Per una tipologia del commento mediolatino: l'"Ars poetica" di Orazio', in: *Il commento ai testi. Atti del Seminario di Ascona (2–9 ottobre 1989)*, a cura di O. Besomi/C. Caruso (Basel/Boston/Berlin) 19–42.
- , (1995) *La tradizione di Orazio e la 'biblioteca di Carlo Magno': per l'elenco di opera nel codice Berlin, Diez B Sant. 66*, in *Formative stages of classical traditions: latin texts from antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a conference held at Erice, 16–22 October 1993*, ed. by O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve, Spoleto, CISAM, (*Biblioteca del 'Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici in Umbria'* 15), 299–322.
- Viparelli, V., (1987) *Rassegna di studi properziani (1982–1987)*, *BStudLat* 17, 19–76.
- Volscus, A., (1482) *Propertii elegiae, Antonius Volscus recognovit* (Romae).
- , (1488) *Antonii Volsci Propertianarum interpretationum libri IV* (Venetiis).
- Walde, C., (2001) *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* (München-Leipzig).
- Walter Bennett, A., (1967) 'Sententia and catalogue in Propertius (3.9.1–20)', *Hermes* 95, 222–43.
- Warden, J., (1978) 'Another Would-Be Amazon: Propertius 4,4,71–72', *Hermes* 106, 177–87.
- , (1980) *Fallax opus: Poet and Reader in the Elegies of Propertius* (Toronto/Buffalo/London) (*Phoenix Suppl.* 14).
- , (1982) 'Epic into Elegy: Propertius 4,9,70f.', *Hermes* 110, 228–42.
- , (1996) 'The dead and the quick: structural correspondences and thematic relationships in Propertius 4.7 and 4.8', *Phoenix* 50 (2), 118–29.
- Watt, W.S., (1992) 'Propertiana', *MH* 49, 233–38.
- , (2004) 'Error Wattianus', *CQ* N.S. 54, 658–60.
- Webb, R., (1997) 'Poetry and Rhetoric', in: S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic [sic] Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Leiden/New York/Cologne).

- Weiden, B. M., (1980) *Cynthia and Rome in the development of Propertius' literary identity* (Diss. Michigan).
- Wenzel, U., (1969) *Properz: Hauptmotive seiner Dichtung: Lebenswahl, Tod, Ruhm und Unsterblichkeit, Kaiser und Rom* (Diss. Freiburg).
- West, M. L. (ed.), (1966) *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford).
- , (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (*Untersuchungen zur Antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 14) (Berlin/New York).
- West, S., (1984) 'Lycophron Italicised', *JHS* 104, 127–51.
- Wheeler, A. L., (1910) 'Propertius as praeceptor amoris', *CPh* 5, 28–40.
- , (1910/11) 'Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources', *CPh* 5, 440–50; 6, 56–77.
- White, P., (1994) *Promised Verse. Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Wilamowitz, U. v. W.-Moellendorff, (1913) *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin).
- , (1924) *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin, 2nd edition 1962).
- , (1927) *Geschichte der Philologie* (Leipzig, 2nd ed.).
- Wild, R., (1996) 'Römische Elegien', in: B. Witte u.a. (edd.), *Goethe Handbuch*, Bd. 1, (Stuttgart/Weimar) 225–232.
- Wilkinson, L. P., (1939) Review of Day (1938), *JRS* 29, 273–74.
- Williams, G., (1985) *Tradition and Originality in Roman poetry* (Oxford 1968, ed. corr. 1985).
- Willis, J., (1972) *Latin Textual Criticism. (Illinois Studies in Classical Literature 61)* (Urbana).
- Wimmel, W., (1960) *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit* (Wiesbaden).
- Wiseman, T. P., (1974) *Cinna the Poet and Other Essays* (Leicester).
- Wistrand, E., (1977) *Miscellanea Propertiana* (Göteborg).
- Wlosok A., (1967) 'Die dritte Cynthia-Elegie des Properz (i,3)', *Hermes* 95, 330–52; reprinted (with slight changes) in: W. Eisenhut (ed.), *Antike Lyrik* (Darmstadt 1970) (*Ars interpretandi* 2) 405–30, and in: A. Wlosok, *Res humanae—res divinae. Kleine Schriften. Hg. v. E. Heck u. E. A. Schmidt* (Heidelberg 1990) (*Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften*, N.F., 2. Reihe, Bd. 84) 157–83.
- Wyke, M., (1987a) 'Written women; Propertius' *scripta puella*', *JRS* 77, 47–61; reprinted (revised version with minor editorial changes) in: M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress. Ancient and Modern Representations* (Oxford 2002) 46–77.
- , (1987b) 'The elegiac woman at Rome', *PCPS* 33, 153–78.
- , (1989) 'Mistress as Metaphor in Augustan Elegy', *Helios* 16, 25–47.
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G., (1979) 'The influence of rhetoric on fourth-century tragedy', *CQ* 39, 66–76.
- Yardley, J. C., (1972) 'Comic Influences in Propertius', *Phoenix* 26, 134–39.
- , (1980) 'Paulus Silentarius, Ovid, and Propertius', *CQ* 30, 239–43.
- , (1983) 'Propertius 4.7.94 yet again', *AJPh* 104, 281–82.
- , (1985) 'L'influence de la comédie sur Properce', *Ann.Fac.Lett.Nice* 50, 359–366.
- Zanker, P., (1983) 'Der Apollotempel auf dem Palatin', in: *Città e Architettura nella Roma Imperiale, AnalRom Suppl.* 10, 21–40.
- , (1987) *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (München), engl. transl.: *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor).
- Zapperi, R., (1999) *Das Inkognito. Goethes ganz andere Existenz in Rom* (München).
- Zetzel, J., (1996) 'Poetic baldness and its cure', *MD* 36, 73–100.
- Zimmermann, B., (1999) 'Goethes *Novelle* und der Hirtenroman des Longos', in: B. Witte/Ponzi, M. (edd.), *Goethes Rückblick auf die Antike* (Berlin) 101–112.
- , (2001) 'Überlegungen zur Aischylos-Rezeption in der Antike und der deutschen Literatur des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts', *Lexis* 19, 109–118.
- , (2001) 'Ovids *Heroides*: Literarische Imitatio und die Intertextualitätstheorie', in: H. Jaumann u.a. (edd.), *Domänen der Literaturwissenschaft* (Tübingen) 213–231.
- Zwierlein, O., (1999) *Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in tiberischer Zeit. Band I: Prolegomena, UaLG* 57 (Berlin/New York).

INDEX

- Actium: 248; 279; 375ff.
adynata: 252 n. 22
 aetiological poetry: 356; *passim*
 Albert of Stade:
 Troilus: 37
 Alberti, Leon Battista: 406
 Alexander of Aetolia: 81; 109f.
 Apollo: 77
 Alexandrian Code: 316; 324–326
 Allius: 82
 Álvarez Hernández, A.: 20
 Amiens: 400f.
 Amor (Eros) 269f.; 306; 315
 inspiring poetry: 272
 analytic ear: 337
 Andromeda: 190
 Anno da Viterbo: 414
 Antigone: 190
 Antimachus of Colophon: 76; 77; 81f.;
 85; 102f.; 322
 Lyde: 76; 77; 82; 85
 Antonio da Rho: 405
 Antonius, Marcus: 281; 375f.
 aphorisms: 148f.
 Apollo: 307; 362; 373ff.
 Palatine: 308; 373ff.
 Apollonius Rhodius: 108; 120f.
 Aragon, court: 408
Ara Maxima: 387ff.
 Aratus: 351
 Archilocheion at Paros: 75
 Archilochus: 257; 326; 350
 Arethusa: 190; 211
 Arezzo: 403
 Aristophanes: 417
 Frogs: 324; 417
 astrology: 362ff.
 aubade: 348
 Augustus: 159; 163; 171f.; 180; 248;
 260; 281; 308
 as defender of liberty: 347
 Bautätigkeit: 359f.
 campaigns: 266
 panegyric: 266f.
 Aurispa, Giovanni: 407
 autobiographical (documentary) fallacy:
 335f.
- Baehrens, E.: 8; 15f.; 56
 Bandini, Domenico: 403
 Barbaro, Ermolao: 414
 Barbaro, Francesco: 410
 Barber, E. A.: 46f.; 51f.; 59–61; 63
 Basinio da Parma: 408
 Barzizza, Gasparino: 405
 Battista da Cingoli: 410
 beauty (natural vs. makeup): 284
 Beccadelli, Antonio (Panormita): 42;
 406–408
 The beloved woman:
 as “inspiration, subject and intended
 addressee”: 183
 as reflection of poet’s self-image: 183
 her faults extended to other women:
 184
 coloured by virtues or faults of
 mythical heroines: 184; 189
 assimilated to *hetaera*: 187–189
 see also *Cynthia*
 see also *women*
 Benedictus Chelidonius: 345 with n. 34
 Bentley, R.: 11; 16; 45
 Beroaldus, F.: 5–7; 51; 53; 412
 Binder, G. and Hamm, U.: 94
 Bittis: 77
 Boccabella, Gian Giacomo: 409
 Boccaccio, Giovanni: 403
 Bologna: 412
 Bona Dea: 207
 Boucher, J.-P.: 71
 Braccesi, Alessandro: 406
 Bracciolini, Poggio: 41f.; 404; 406;
 410; 412
 Bremer, J. M.: 90
 Brescia: 411
 Briseis: 196
 Broekhuysen, J. van: 10; 51; 64
 Bruni Leonardo: 404
 Burman, P. (Secundus): 9; 11
 Butler, H. E.: 46; 60f.
 Butler, H. E. and Barber, E. A.: 76
 Butrica, J. L.: 9; 15; 17–19; 47; 56;
 60; 63; 65; 91–93; 399–401;
 403–413

- Cairns, F.: 89f.
 Calderini, D.: 4–6; 412
 Callimachus: 72; 94; 97; 105ff.;
 110–112; 114–119; 121–124; 128;
 139f.; 171; 173–80; 210; 249; 272;
 291; 316; 318; 320; 321; 322; 323;
 324; 327; 329; 339; 352; 361f.;
 374ff.; 406; 427
Acontius and Cydippe: 85
Aetia: 78f.; 85; 113 n. 74; 115f.; 268
 n. 74; 307; 322–325; 329; 338;
 340; 356
 and the *genus tenue*: 211
Iambi: 78
 imitation of Hesiod's *Theogony*: 79f.
 Callinus: 73
 Calliope: 170; 176
 Calvus: 133–137; 211; 318
 Camenae: 177
 Camerarius, Johannes: 418
 Cameron, A.: 20
 Campano, Giovannantonio: 408
 Campofregoso, Giovanni: 405
 Camps, W. A.: 53f.; 61
carmina dicere digna: 89
 carving beloved's name on tree-bark:
 84f.
 Cassiodorus: 399
 Catullus: 55; 58; 72; 86; 88; 94;
 129–131; 158; 165; 174; 251; 257;
 262; 277f.; 296; 307; 318; 332;
 402–404; 408–413; 418f.; 424f.
 as writer of elegy: 81f.
 change
 of addressee: 265 n. 67
 of tone: 265
 Charlemagne: 399
 Chartres: 400
 Choerilus of Samos: 112f.
 Cicero: 127; 202; 400; 404;
 412
 Cillenio, Bernardino: 411
 Cinna: 135
 Claudian: 399
 Cleopatra: 163; 197–8
 closing lines: 249
 coherence of poems: 301
 Colonia: 405
 Colonna, Francesco: 414
 Colophon: 74f.
 comparison
 with nature: 254; 257; 290
 with hetaeras: 258
 with a soldier's life: 261
 complexion (*color*): 210
 concealment of art: 203
consolatio: 215
 Corbie: 400
 Cornelia: 50; 186; 392ff.
 Cos, statue of Philetas at: 77
 countryside: 285f.
 Courtney, E.: 61; 63
 Cupid: 148; 156
 Cusano, Niccolò: 410
 Cyrrhus: 76
 Cynthia: 58; 226–228; 379ff.
 abandoned Propertius: 261
 attempt of the poet to free himself:
 256
 beauty: 251f.; 287; 295; 304f.
 complains infidelity of Propertius:
 286; 379ff.
 culture: 253; 268; 294
 cupidity: 280
 greed for money: 281
 infidelity: 264; 268; 283f.; 288; 293f.
 kindness: 287
 source of inspiration: 247
 way of life: 256; 310f.
 see also *The beloved woman*
 see also *women*
 Danaë: 187; 190
 Dante: 328; 341; 347 n. 40; 350;
 400
 D'Artegna, Guarnerio: 410
 Day, A. A.: 69–72; 94; 89f.
 death: 160–164; 300ff.; 392ff.
 afterlife: 271
 early: 250; 273; 295
 funeral: 271; 273; 295
 grave inscriptions: 273
 suicide: 263; 283
 wish to die: 262; 264; 303
 Decembrio, Angelo: 405
 Decembrio, Pier Candido: 405
 Demophoon: 150; 289
 dialogue: 252 n. 23
 divinization: 253
doctus: 339
domina: 88; 331f.
 Dousa, J. (filius): 10
 Dousa, J. (pater): 10
 dream: 297f.
Du-Stil: 343
 Eberhardus Germanus: 342
 elegy
 and courtship: 207
 and comedy: 20

and epigram: 20
 and magic: 207
 Eliot, T. S.: 425
 Empedocles (four elements): 339; 347
 Ennius: 361
 Annals: 113 n. 74; 391 n. 189
 epigram, erotic/hellenistic: 72; 253
 n. 24; 264 n. 63; 269f.; 276 n. 101
 epigrams (*sententiae*): 215
 Este, family: 407
ethopoeia: 214; 357; 366ff.; 373; 392ff.
 Euphorion of Chalcis: 97–101; 142
 examples from mythology: 64; 236;
 255; 259; 262ff.; 273ff.; 277; 281f.;
 284; 287f.; 295; 302; 311

Facino, Galeazzo: 414
 fame by poetry: 268; 287; 295
 Fedeli, P.: 46f.; 52; 63; 65
 Federico de' Conti: 4
 Ferrara: 407
 Ferrari, Giulio Emilio: 414
 Filelfo, Francesco: 410f.
 first inventor: 314
 Florence: 403ff.; 412f.
foedus amoris: 332
 Fontein, P.: 51
 force against a girl: 257; 277
 fortunetellers: 255
 France: 39; 400f.
 Fruter, L.: 50f.
furor (love as): 155f.; 320

Galla: 196
 Gallus, Cornelius: 58; 73; 83–86; 88;
 94; 97–100; 141–145; 149f.;
 155–157; 162; 167f.; 173; 208; 286
 n. 132; 297; 320
 Amores 84; 88
 propemptikon for Lycoris: 84
 Qasir Ibrim fragment (Fr. 2
 Courtney): 69; 87–89
 Genoa: 405; 411; 414
 Gérard d'Abbeville: 401
 Gerbert of Reims, Pope Silvester II:
 399f.
 Giangrande, G.: 47
 Giardina, G. C.: 47; 65
 Giovanni da Carpi: 407
Gnomai, amatory: 64
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von:
 419–424; 428
 Hermann and Dorothea: 421
 Römische Elegien: 419–424; 428

Goold, G. P.: 9; 17f.; 47f.; 50; 52;
 54f.; 63–65
 Gorgias: 208
 Graeve, J. G.: 10
 Grandner Hale, William: 425
 Greek words: 252
 Gronovius, J. F.: 53
 Guarino da Verona: 404; 407
 Günther, Christian: 418
 Günther, H.-C.: 9; 18; 47f.; 61–63;
 94f.
 Gygean Vision: 334

 Hanslik, R.: 46; 64
 Haupt, M.: 8
 Havet, L.: 17
 Heinsius, N.: 10; 11; 50–53; 412
 Helen: 189; 194
 Hellenistic epigram and elegy,
 relationship between: 92
 Hercules: 91; 206; 294; 387ff.
 Hermesianax of Colophon: 76; 81;
 102–104
 Leontion: 74; 77
 Hermobios: 74
 Hertzberg, W. A. B.: 14–16.
 Hesiod: 173; 322; 426
 Catalogue of Women: 80f.
 Theogony: 78–80
 Works and Days: 426
 Heyworth, S. J.: 19; 47f.; 60f.; 65
 Hinds, S. J.: 89
 Hipponax: 322
 Holzberg, N.: 20
 Homer: 417
 Iliad: 417
 Odyssey: 417; 422
 Homeric Hymns: 80
 Horace: 179f.; 259; 289; 378; 399f.;
 417f.
 A.P.: 77; 320; 392; 394; 341
 C. 4: 326; 330; 356
 Horos: 59
 Hose, M.: 93
 Housman, A. E.: 7; 15f.; 18 n. 62; 45;
 53f.; 61f.
 Hubbard, M.: 21; 59; 62
 hunting: 85

 Ino: 190
 irony: 279; 383ff.; 387ff.
 Italy: 40f.; 401ff.
Jupiter Feretrius: 390ff.
 Isis: 303; 312f.

- Jachmann, G.: 18.
 Jacoby, F.: 20; 89f.; 94
 John of Salisbury: 36; 400
 Juvenal: 62f.; 400; 404

 Kambylis, A.: 20
 Keil, H.: 14
 Kenney, E. J.: 8
 Klopstock: 419
 Knebel, Karl Ludwig von: 420–422;
 424
 Knoche, U.: 18
 Knox, P.: 94

 labile imagination: 348
 Lachmann, K.: 3; 8; 11–15; 19; 48;
 56f.; 415
 lampoons: 257
 Landino, Cristoforo: 406
 Laodameia and Protesilaos: 251
 La Penna, A.: 64f.
laudatio funebris: 215
 legal language: 206
lena: 214; 372f.
 Leo, F.: 16f.; 20; 90
 Leonidas of Tarentum: 114
 Lesbia: 129f.
 Leto Pomponio: 42; 410
 link-passages: 78
 Lipsius, J.: 52
 Livineius, J.: 53
 Lombardy: 405
 Longus:
 Daphnis and Chloe: 77
 looseness of expression: 348
 Lovati, Lovato: 401
 love
 and death: 379ff.
 as a tormenting passion: 250
 as a disease: 153–6; 250
 as crime: 370ff.
 as self-deception: 343
 comparison with family bounds: 285
 everlasting: 249f., 264; 271; 278;
 283; 289; 294; 381
 hardships: 254
 the metaphor of the ship of love:
 276
 life, dedicated to love: 307
 of boys: 255
 of courtesans: 291ff.
 love/war antithesis: 88
 love-elegy, subjective vs. objective:
 70–95 *passim*
 love-poet as soldier: 84
 love themes vs. epic themes: 267; 315
 love poetry: 318ff.
 The lover
 as enslaved by woman, or by his
 own desire? 197f.
 lover's vows: 264
 Lucan: 62f.; 400
 Luck, G.: 20
 Lucretius: 282
 Luder, Peter: 418
 Ludovico il Moro: 413f.
 Lycoris: 84; 88
 Lycophron of Chalcis: 124f.
 Lynceus: 157; 315
 Lyne, R. O. A. M.: 19; 20

macrologia/brachylogia: 82
 Maecenas: 62; 113; 171; 177; 247f.;
 250; 336
 magic: 208; 250; 255; 301; 306
 Manetti, Giannozzo: 404
 Manuzio, Aldo: 414
 Marcanova, Giovanni: 403
 Mariano *de Magistris de Urbe*: 410
 Marrasio, Giovanni: 408
 marriage: 366ff.; 392ff.
 marriage laws: 159; 260
 Marsuppini, Carlo: 403
 Martelli, M.: 406
 Martellotti, G.: 404
 Martial: 399; 404; 408; 414
 Martini, Simone: 402
 Mazzatosta, Fabio: 410
 Medea: 191; 197
 medicine: 153f.
 Meleager of Gadara: 107; 326
 Menander:
 Haut. Tim.: 349
 Menippean satire: 326
 Merula, Giorgio: 414
 metapoetics: 168–180
 Michelangelo: 328
 Milan: 405; 410ff.
militia amoris (love as warfare): 158–160
 mime: 342
 Mimnermeion at Smyrna: 75
 Mimnermus: 72; 81; 150; 170
 Nanno: 73f.; 75; 76
 Smyrneis: 340
 mistress, the concept of: 330–332
 monobiblos: 27ff.; 220–223
 Morelli, A. M.: 91f.; 95
 Müller, L.: 62

- multipolar mind: 333
 Murgia, C. E.: 19
 Mussato, Albertino: 401
 Mutina: 248
 mythical heroines: 184; 189; 251
 fidelity of: 190; 195
 suffering or victimized: 190
 their beauty and innocence: 193
 their wantonness: 194
 their unnatural desires: 194

 Naldi Naldo: 406
 Naples: 408, 413
narratio: 202; 371
 see *speaker*
neglectus amator: 88
nequitia: 88
 neoteric: 127f.
 Neumann, E.: 19
 Niccoli Niccolò: 42; 404f.
 Niccolò V, Pope: 409
 Nori Mariotto: 406

obsequium: 148
 Omphale: 197
 orality: 337
 oratory:
 Atticist: 211
 forensic: 206
 Stoic: 212
 originality vs. imitation: 90
 Orléans: 36; 400f.
 Orpheus: 85; 272
 Ortalus: 82
 Otto III, emperor: 399
 Oudendorp, F.: 52
 Ovid: 48f.; 63; 200; 367; 402ff.; 419;
 421f.
 Amores: 29; 58; 421; 424
 Heroides: 49
 Metamorphoses: 422

 Padua: 401; 403
 paintings: 270
 erotic: 259
 Paley, F. A.: 53
pallor (of lover) 155; 290
 Palmer, A.: 15; 54
 Panthus: 152; 288 n. 139
 Papia: 401
 Paris: 401
 Parrasio, Aulo Giano: 413
 Parsons, P. J.: 90f.
 Partenio, Antonio: 411

 Parthenius of Nicaia 83; 110; 120; 339
 Encomium for Arete: 83
 Epikedion for Arete: 83
 Erotika Pathemata: 83f.; 109 n. 60
 and Cornelius Gallus: 83f.
 teacher of Virgil: 83
 Pasquali, G.: 45
 pastoral: 138–140
patronus/amicus: 333f.
 Paullus: 50
 Pavia: 413
 Pasiphae: 191; 196
 Penelope: 190; 196
 Pentesilea: 197
perfidia (of the girl): 213
 performances: 337
 Persius: 400; 404
 persuasion: 201
 Petrarca, Francesco: 401ff.
 Petroni, Bartolomeo: 413
 Petronius: 41; 405
 Phaedra: 191
 Phanocles: 81
 Erotes e kaloi: 78
 Pherecles: 74
 Philetas of Cos: 72; 77; 94; 104–106;
 128; 175; 177–180; 316; 427
 Philoctetes: 214
 Phillimore, J. S.: 18 n. 65; 45; 47; 55
 Philodemus: 319
 Piccolomini, Enea Silvio, Pope Pius II:
 404; 408f.
 Pietro Odo di Montopoli: 409
 Pindar: 177; 268; 321; 324; 327; 420
 Pipin, king: 399
 Pisani Ugolino: 404
 Platon: 394; 412; 421f.
 Symposion: 421f.
 Plutarch: 76
 Polenton, Sicco: 410
 Poliziano, Angelo: 42; 406; 409;
 412–414
 Pompeius, Sextus: 248
 Pontano, Giovanni: 406–408; 413
 Ponticus: 149; 152; 155; 157; 169–70;
 212
 Postgate, J. P.: 18; 45; 49; 63
 Pound, Erza: 425–428
 Homage to Sextus Propertius: 425
praeceptor amoris (teacher of love):
 147–153
 prayer: 206
 principle of organization in Propertius:
 339

- prologue/epilogue sections: 78
propempticon: 297
 Propertius: 86; 88; 399–411, 413; 416;
 418–420; 422–426
 Books 1–3: 29; 353
 Book 1: 27f.; 30; 86f.; 106;
 147–151; 155; 169f.; 184–186;
 219–237; 243; 292 with n. 152;
 304; 315
 Books 2–4: 29f.; 56 n. 32
 Book 2: 9; 14; 19; 29; 33; 34f.;
 55–60; 114 n. 78; 151f.; 170–175;
 186–195; 245–246; 273 n. 93;
 309; 355
 Book 3: 9; 14; 33; 115; 153;
 175–178; 195–198; 319–352; 355
 Book 4: 26; 33; 113 n. 74; 115–125;
 115 n. 83; 176–180; 316 n. 215;
 309; 326; 330; 353–395; 389
 n. 176
 anticipating *Heroides* format: 209f.;
 367
 biographical information on him:
 200
 book division: 19; 27ff.; 55–57; 65;
 273 n. 93
 book structure: 228ff.; 245 n. 1;
 339f.; 353ff.
 differences between book 1 and 2:
 246
 elegies often ‘open’ and undecided:
 204; 215
 manuscripts: 38ff.; see also below
 The textual tradition of Propertius:
 poem divisions: 33; 58–60; *passim*
 ‘rhetorical’ compared to Ovid: 200
 vs. Tibullus: 204
 see also ‘textual tradition of
 Propertius’
 Propertius nauta: 338
 proverbial saying: 262
 Protesilaus and Laodamia: 82
 Puccius, F.: 14; 413
 Puelma, M.: 94; 95
 Puteanus, C.: 6

 Quintilian: 48; 406
quiritatio: 215

 realism: 202
recitare: 337
recusatio: 137; 171; 247; 266
 Reggio Emilia: 413
 Reims: 399

 relationships, changing: 289
 rhetoric:
 ancient conception: 199
 and drama: 202
 rhetorical features defined: 201–204
 rhetorical motifs: 204; 214
 rhetorical situations: 203; 212
 technical: 201
 rhetorical theory:
 and metalanguage: 202
 used in Homer scholia: 199
 Ribbeck, O.: 62
 Richard of Fournival: 26f.; 36; 400f.
 Richmond, O. L.: 17ff.; 45
 Rimini: 407
 Rinuccini Alamanno: 404
 rival: 262; 264f.; 279f.; 288; 297
 Roman elegiac canon: 81
 Roman love elegy: 336
 Roman values: 278f.; 312; 356; 392ff.;
 passim
 Rome: 358ff.; 406; 409; 411f.
 moral conditions: 259; 280; 312
 Romulus: 151; 258
 Rosen, R. M. and Farrell, J.: 89; 94
 Ross, David O., Jr.: 88
 Rossberg, C.: 54; 64
 Rothstein, M.: 16f.; 20

 Salutati, Coluccio 4; 403; 405
 Sannazzaro, Jacopo: 408
 Santen, L. van: 9; 11
 Sappho: 268
 satiric dimension: 350
saturnalia: 157
 Scaliger, I. C.: 6
 Scaliger, J. J.: 6–10; 14; 18; 51; 60;
 414
 Schiller, Friedrich: 419–421
 Über naive und sentimentale Dichtung:
 419; 421
 Schlegel, August Wilhelm: 419
 Schrader, J.: 52
 Schulz-Vanheyden, F.: 20.
 Scinzenzeler, Ulrich: 414
 Scylla: 197
 Secundus, Johannes: 418
 self-interpretation: 380f.
 self-irony: 314
 Semiramis: 197
 Seneca the Elder: 203
 Seneca: 63
 serio-comedy: 326
 Serra, Giovanni: 409

- servitium amoris* (love as slavery): 88; 91;
156–158; 314; 363
- Servius: 402
- Seta, della, Lombardo: 403
- Sforza, family: 410f., 413f.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R.: 17; 46
- Siena: 408
- Simon Aureacapra: 36
- Skutsch, Franz: 88
- Solon: 73
- sound gesture: 342
- Sozomeno from Pistoia: 405
- speaker: 202
- spoudogeloion: 326f.
- Statius: 400; 411; 414
- Stikville*: 200
- St. Riquier: 400
- Stroh, W.: 20
- Strozzi, Ercole: 407f.
- Strozzi Tito Vespasiano: 407f.
- subjective frames: 78; 81
- Sulmonese, Bartolomeo: 409
- Sulzer, Johann Georg: 419
Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste:
419
- symposion: 313; 315
- sympotic/carnival style: 339
- Tacitus
Annales: 49
- Tarpeia: 53; 64; 370ff.
- Tatius: 53; 64
- Teia: 54
- Terence: 400
Eunuchus: 183; 187
- The textual tradition of Propertius:
apparatus criticus: 46f.
archetype (medieval): 7; 26ff.; 37f.;
49f.; 52; 55
corruptions: 31ff.; 50ff.
error Wattianus: 52
dislocations (transpositions): 8; 18;
32f.; 48, 60–63, 65
editing:
conservatism, in editing
Propertius: 45–65
scepticism, in editing Propertius:
45–65
editions: 45ff.; 65
editio princeps: 3; 12
Florence, Bibl. Riccardiana,
Edizioni rare 372: 413
Rome, Bibl. Corsiniana, Inc. 50 F
37: 412
- incorporation of glosses: 31f.
- interpolations: 33f.; 48; 63f.
collaborative: 63
- lacunae: 57; 59
- manuscripts:
Berlin, Staatsbibl., Diez B. Sant.
66: 38; 399
Berlin, Staatsbibl., lat. fol. 500:
409
Bern, Burgerbibl., 276: 39; 401
Δ family: 4; 17; 19
Daventriensis I. 82: 10 n. 29; 11;
15; 16; 18 n. 63.
Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibl.,
Dc. 133: 413
Egerton 3027 (Cuiacianus): 7
Florence, Bibl. Laur., pl. 36, 49:
4; 16; 18 n. 63; 403
Florence, Bibl. Laur. San Marco,
690: 405
Florence, Bibl. Naz. Centrale,
Magliabechi, VII 1053: 407
Genève-Cologne, Bibl.
Bodmeriana, cod. Bod. Lat.
141: 42 ; 409
Grenoble, Bibl. de la Ville, 549:
413
Groninganus Bibl. Univ., B.P.L.
133 A: 13ff.
Holkham. Misc. 36 (nunc
Bodleianus): 18 n. 63
Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniv., Voss.
Lat. O. 38: 26f.; 38ff.; 400f.
Leidensis Vossianus 117: 18
n. 63
Leningrad, Bibl. Saltykov-
Shchedrin, Cl. lat. Q 12: 410
Milan, Bibl. Ambr., A 79 inf.:
402
Milan, Bibl., Ambr. I 67 sup.: 38;
413
München, Bayerische Staatsbibl.,
Cbm C 209 a: 413
München, Universitätsbibl., Cim.
22: 42; 409
Neapolitanus, nunc Guelferbytanus
Gudianus 224: 10; 11; 13ff.;
26f.; 38ff.; 400; 405f.; 412f.
Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Holkham
misc. 36: 40ff.; 405
Par. Lat. 2201: 402
Par. Lat. 7989: 40ff.; 405
Par. Lat. 8233: 42
Par. Lat. 15155: 401

- Petrarchan manuscript: 18 n. 63;
 19; 40ff.
 Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 15: 42;
 410
 Salamanca, Bibl. Univ., 87: 400
 San Daniele in Friuli, Bibl. Civica
 Guarnieriana, 56: 410
 Vat. Ott. Lat. 1514: 15; 16; 18
 n. 93
 Vat. Reg. Lat. 2120 (Florilegium
 Gallicum): 36; 401
 Vat. Urb. Lat. 641: 42
 Vat. Lat. 1595: 410
 Vat. Lat. 3273: 42; 406
 Venice, Bibl. Marc., Z 443
 [1912]: 4; 403
 Voss. Lat. O. 38: 11; 15f.
 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August
 Bibl., Helmst, 338: 407
 X-family: 26f.; 38ff.
 Theocritus: 86; 108; 153; 349
 Theognis (Theognidean corpus): 73;
 75; 76; 86; 350
 Theogenes of Icus: 79
 thinness (of lover): 155
 Tibullus: 48f.; 55; 59; 86; 88; 147;
 161; 168; 204; 302; 328; 374; 399,
 402, 404–413; 418; 420f.; 424
 Book 1: 85ff.
 Tibullus and Propertius, chronological
 order: 81; 86
 Timpanaro, S.: 8
 Tomacelli, Leo: 407
 Tomacelli, Marino: 408
 Tortelli, Giovanni: 409
 Tränkle, H.: 19; 57
 Traube, L.: 400
 Traversari, Ambrogio: 404
 Tullus: 149; 158
 Turnebus, A.: 6
 turns, unexpected: 299
 Tuscany: 403f., 406
 Tyrell, R. Y.: 51
 Twelve Tables: 209
 types of speech: 203; 209
 Tyrtæus: 73
 Uhlmann, G.: 19
 Umbria: 408
utilitas: 320
 Vahlen, J.: 51
 Valla, Bernardino: 412
 Valla, Lorenzo: 405, 409f.
 Varius Rufus: 102f.; 316 n. 214
 Varro Atacinus: 83; 131–133; 318
Leucadia: 83
 venereal elegy and martial epic,
 antithesis between: 340
 Verona: 399; 407; 411
 Vertumnus: 365ff.
 Vettori, Pier: 413
 Viarre, S.: 65
 Vindelino da Spira: 4; 411
vindictio: 213
 Virgil: 128; 137–140; 172; 177; 375f.;
 387f.; 400f.; 404; 418f.; 426; 428
Eclogues: 86; 94; 317; 426
Georgica: 317; 419
 Visconti, Gaspere: 414
 vision: 164–168
 Vittorino da Feltre: 404
 Vivarium: 399
 Volsus, A.: 5f.; 410; 412
 Voss, Johann Heinrich: 419
 Watt, W. S.: 52
 West, M. L.: 75
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von: 6;
 10; 20
 Wimmel, W.: 20.
 Winckelmann, Johann Joachim: 422;
 424
 witnesses: 213
 women:
 anger, vindictiveness: 192
 “bad” women: 191
 emancipated: 253
 emotional, to be humoured: 185
 fickleness: 191; 198; 296
 impotentia: 198
 perjury: 193; 198
 rejection of chastity, lustfulness: 193f.
 198
 tyranny and corruption of
 contemporary women: 196
 see also *The beloved woman*
 see also *Cynthia*
 works of art: 308f.
 Zanobi da Strada: 403

INDEX LOCORUM

- Alexander Aetolus
 fr. 1 Powell: 101 n. 14
 fr. 3.22 Powell: 109; 120
 fr. 3.31 Powell: 109
- Anonymus
 apud Michael Choniates: 101
POxy 3732: 69; 90–94
PVindob. G 40611: 95
SH 961: 95
SH 962: 92 n. 51; 93
SH 964.1–20: 92f. with n. 51; 93
 n. 53
SH 964.22–45: 92f. with n. 51; 93
 n. 53; 94 n. 56
SH 961: 95
- Anthologia Palatina*
 5.128: 277 n. 105
 5.252: 277 n. 105
 6.7.8: 276 n. 103
 7.409.3f.: 337
 9.823: 310 n. 200
 11.20.2: 325
 11.20.6: 325
 12.30–32: 284 n. 127
 12.156: 276 n. 101
 12.166: 272 n. 87
 12.201: 290 n. 145
- Antimachus
 fr. 67–97 M.: 103
 fr. 85 M.: 103 n. 28
 fr. 93 M.: 103 n. 26
 test. 13 M.: 103 n. 25
- Antipater Sidonius
Anth. Pal. 7.713: 114 n. 77
Anth. Pal. 7.409: 103 with n. 30
- Antipater Thessalonicensis
Anth. Pal. 11.20.3f.: 104 n. 38
Anth. Pal. 11.31: 105
- Apollodorus
 1.9.12: 255 n. 33
- Apollonius Rhodius
Arg. 1.1207ff.: 101; 108
Arg. 1.1213ff.: 109 n. 58
Arg. 1.1298ff.: 108 n. 56
- fr. 4 Powell: 118
 fr. 12 Powell: 120f.
- Apuleius
Apol. 10: 227 with n. 42
- Archias
Anth. Pal. 5.59: 306 n. 186
Anth. Pal. 5.98: 270
- Aristaenetus
Epist. 1.10: 107
- Aristoteles
E.N. 1098a 26–29: 335
E.N. 1128a 22–24: 328
Rhet. 1398b: 75 n. 18
Rhet. 1411b 25: 352
Poet. 1447a 16: 319
Poet. 1449a 20: 326
Poet. 1451a 24: 325
Poet. 1451b5–6: 319
Poet. 1460a 2–5: 320
Poet. 1460a7–8: 320
- Asclepiades
Anth. Pal. 9.63: 103 n. 25
- Athenaeus
 13.562c: 269 n. 80
- Auctor ad Herennium
 2.10: 213 n. 43
 4.7: 216 n. 51
 4.24f.: 215 n. 50
- Augustus
res gest. 19: 359f.
res gest. 35: 359f.
- Ausonius
Epp. 10.30: 327 n. 11
- Butas
SH 234–36: 120 n. 100
- Carmina Anacreontea*
 13.14–17 West: 269 n. 79
- Callimachus
 fr. 1.1–33: 78
 fr. 1.1ff.: 111
 fr. 1.3–5: 111
 fr. 1.11f.: 316 n. 212

fr. 1.17–21: 176; 268 n. 74; 307
 fr. 1.19f.: 111; 323
 fr. 1, 20: 110; 321; 363 n. 55
 fr. 1.21–24: 247 with n. 6
 fr. 1.24: 272 n. 89
 fr. 1.25–28: 272 n. 90
 fr. 1.27f.: 111; 117; 324
 fr. 1.28: 111; 324
 fr. 1.40: 352
 fr. 2: 78; 79; 111; 272 n. 89
 fr. 2.1: 324; 268 n. 74
 fr. 3: 79
 fr. 7.13f.: 78; 272 n. 91
 fr. 7.19ff.: 79
 fr. 7.19f.: 177
 fr. 7.22: 112
 fr. 16: 103
 fr. 21.4: 108 n. 53
 fr. 23.19f.: 122
 fr. 24.10ff.: 122
 fr. 24.13: 109 n. 58
 fr. 31b–e: 118
 fr. 43.46ff.: 79
 fr. 57.1: 324
 frs. 67–75: 106
 fr. 73: 85; 324
 fr. 75.4: 108 n. 55
 fr. 75.21: 99 n. 7
 fr. 75.50–52: 123
 fr. 75.54: 118 n. 92
 fr. 75.62f.: 115 n. 31
 fr. 76: 79
 fr. 79: 79
 fr. 86: 79
 fr. 100.1f.: 119
 fr. 101: 119 n. 96
 fr. 110 : 116 with n. 85
 fr. 112: 78
 fr. 112, 5f.: 79
 fr. 112.7ff.: 80
 fr. 112.9: 78f.
 fr. 114: 119
 fr. 178: 79; 123
 fr. 178.33: 338
 fr. 187: 118
 fr. 201: 119 n. 95
 fr. 226: 335
 fr. 282: 337
 fr. 532: 104 n. 34
 fr. 723: 119 n. 95
 fr. 383: 327
 fr. 384: 327
 fr. 398: 103 n. 25
 fr. 460: 351

SH 238.9ff.: 118
SH 254–268C: 115 n. 84
SH 276: 118
hymn. 1.18ff.: 117
hymn. 2: 180
hymn. 2.105–13: 111; 176
hymn. 2.105: 324
hymn. 2.106: 338
hymn. 2.107: 324
hymn. 2.110: 98 n. 5
hymn. 2.111–12: 321
hymn. 2.110–12: 325
hymn. 2.113: 324
hymn. 3.160f.: 122 n. 103
hymn. 4.90ff.: 117
hymn. 5: 180; 388 n. 167
hymn. 5.5ff.: 122 n. 105
hymn. 5. 102: 122f. n. 105
epigr. 8.6: 324
epigr. 21.4: 324
epigr. 27: 351
epigr. 27.3: 272 n. 89
epigr. 28.1: 326
epigr. 28.3f.: 321
epigr. 28.4: 323
epigr. 28.4: 272 n. 90
epigr. 28: 291 n. 148
epigr. 31.5: 291 n. 148
epigr. 32.1: 324
epigr. 35: 273 n. 94
epigr. 35.2: 339
epigr. 42: 335
epigr. 46: 335

Calvus

fr. 9: 133 n. 28
 fr. 15–16: 136; 318 n. 224

Cassius Dio

49.15.5: 374
 53.1.4: 374
 54.19.1: 374
 54.19.8: 374
 54.19.20: 374

Catullus

1: 108
 4.1: 358 n. 24
 5: 307
 5.4–6: 277 n. 106
 5.5f.: 165
 6.6–14: 305 n. 183
 8: 256 n. 37
 10.2: 331
 16.3f.: 319
 35.12: 198 n. 26

- 35.17: 269 n. 76
 42: 204
 45.8f.: 253 n. 26
 45.17f.: 253 n. 26
 50.16: 335
 64: 130
 64.76: 108 n. 55
 64.132ff.: 206; 367
 65–116: 95
 65: 82; 86
 65.2: 268 n. 76
 65.3: 323
 66: 82
 66.13f.: 158
 66.35f.: 116
 67: 82; 185f.
 68: 72; 82; 84; 129f.
 68.135–140: 296
 68.135–137: 311
 70: 192 n. 15
 70.2: 253 n. 27
 72: 285
 72.2: 253 n. 27
 72.3f.: 82 n. 28
 76: 349
 76.25: 250 n. 15
 87.3f.: 332
 95: 247; 317
 95.5f.: 272 n. 91
 95.10: 102; 272 n. 90
 96: 135f.; 318 n. 224
 109.5f.: 249 n. 13
 109.6: 288 n. 138; 332
- Celsus
proem. 13: 154 n. 7
- Cercidas
 fr. 5.27–32 Powell: 292 n. 150
- Choerilus
SH 3.17.2–5: 112f.
- Cicero
Att. 7.2.1: 127
Brut. 217: 209
Brut. 279: 128 n. 5
Brut. 283: 128 n. 5; 211 n. 36
Brut. 291: 211 n. 36
Cael. 34: 215 n. 51; 332
Cluent. 139: 335
De div. 1.34: 411
De orat. 2.26: 333
De orat. 2.60: 210
De orat. 2.159: 212
De orat. 3.141: 214 n. 47
De orat. 3.199: 210
- Fam.* 15.21.4: 128 n. 5
Fin. 2.90: 53
Inv. 2.18ff.: 206
Lael.: 3.11f.: 394
Lael. 32: 288 n. 137
Lael. 62: 288 n. 137
Lael. 65: 288 n. 137
Lael. 78: 288 n. 137
Nat. deor. 2.56: 331
Orat. 128f.: 209
Orat. 161: 128
Orat. 130: 207
Phil. 2.20: 332
Phil. 2.63: 214
Phil. 2.69: 332
Sest. 3: 207
Tusc. disp. 3.45: 97
Tusc. disp. 17.49: 350
- Clemens Alexandrinus
Strom. III 40 (Dindorf): 329
- Cornutus
ND 25: 270 n. 81
- Demosthenes
Or. 18. 97: 349
- Diodorus
 1.24.8: 313 n. 206
 2.9.4: 197 n. 25
- Diogenes Laertius
 1.88: 75 n. 18
- Dionysius Halicarnassensis
 2.38ff.: 371
- Dioscorides
Anth. Pal. 5.55.2: 278 n. 112
- Donatus
Vita Verg. 38: 342
Vita Verg. 45: 317 n. 217
- Eubulus comicus
 fr. 67 K.: 345
- Euphorion
 fr. 9 Powell: 100 n. 11
 fr. 43 Powell: 98; 142
 fr. 44 Powell: 100
 fr. 48 Powell (*SH* 427.2): 98; 99
 fr. 51.13 Powell: 121 n. 102
 fr. 52 Powell: 121 n. 101
 fr. 74 Powell: 101
 fr. 75 Powell: 101 n. 13
 fr. 102 Powell: 101
SH 428.8f.: 101
SH 415.14: 100

- SH* 415.16: 100
SH 442.7: 100 n. 11
- Euripides
Alc. 280ff.: 394
Hec. 824: 203 n. 16
Hec. 835: 203 n. 16
Med. 132: 132
- Gallus
 fr. 2 Courtney: 69; 84 n. 30; 87–89;
 143; 248 n. 10; 296 n. 161; 318
 n. 224
 fr. 3 Büchner: 329 n. 14; 342
 fr. 4 Büchner: 332
- Gorgias
Hel. 14: 208
- Hermesianax Colophonius:
 fr. 6 Powell: 120 n. 97
 fr. 7.27–34 Powell: 102
 fr. 7.27ff. Powell: 74 n. 15
 fr. 7.35–40 Powell: 73f.
 fr. 7.41–46 Powell: 103
 fr. 7.41–45 Powell: 76
 fr. 7.75–78 Powell: 77
- Herodotus
 1.181f.: 197 n. 25
 2.41.2: 313 n. 206
 2.55: 99 n. 7
- Hesiodus
Theog. 22ff.: 90
Theog. 1019–1021: 80
- Homerus
Il. 1.1ff.: 79 n. 24
Il. 2.484ff.: 79 n. 24
Il. 3.156ff.: 253 n. 28; 382 n. 141
Il. 3.222: 204 n. 19
Il. 6.484: 326
Il. 11.218ff.: 79 n. 24
Il. 14.508ff.: 79 n. 24
Il. 16.112ff.: 79 n. 24
Il. 19.407: 103
Il. 23.99ff.: 380
Od. 1.1ff.: 79 n. 24
Od. 3.403: 332
Od. 7.347: 332
Od. 11.235–259: 197 n. 22
Od. 11.289: 255 n. 33
Od. 15.225: 255 n. 33
Od. 17.541f.: 253 n. 26
- Horatius
A.P. 47f.: 329 n. 14
A.P. 77: 320
- A.P.* 226: 327
A.P. 295: 325
A.P. 132: 326
A.P. 392: 341
A.P. 394: 341
A.P. 408: 325
A.P. 438: 330
C. 1.1.29: 268 n. 76
C. 1.2.51f.: 266 n. 70
C. 1.6: 266; 317
C. 1.9.7: 269 n. 76
C. 1.12.52–56: 266 n. 70
C. 1.13.17f.: 278 n. 107
C. 1.25: 350
C. 1.27.3: 346
C. 1.31: 308; 374
C. 1.31.1: 379 n. 131
C. 1.32: 383
C. 1.33: 289
C. 1.33.2f.: 320
C. 1.35.29–40: 266 n. 70
C. 1.37: 198
C. 1.37.10: 198 n. 26
C. 2.4.15f.: 109 n. 57
C. 2.11.25f.: 333 n. 21
C. 2.12: 266
C. 2.19: 378
C. 2.20.14–16: 261 n. 54
C. 3.1: 180; 378
C. 3.1.1ff.: 374
C. 3.1.1f.: 362
C. 3.1.2f.: 321
C. 3.1.3: 342
C. 3.2.21f.: 395
C. 3.3.42–44: 266 n. 70
C. 3.4: 378 n. 129
C. 3.5.1–4: 266 n. 70
C. 3.6: 259; 356; 395; 395 n. 204
C. 3.6.5: 378
C. 3.7: 395 n. 204
C. 3.15: 350
C. 3.25: 378
C. 3.27: 93
C. 3.29.1: 365 n. 61
C. 3.30: 268 n. 75; 330; 341; 363
C. 4.2: 361; 377; 415
C. 4.2.1: 321
C. 4.2.10: 327
C. 4.2.11f.: 327 n. 11
C. 4.5.19: 344
C. 4.5.21ff.: 395
C. 4.5.34: 359 n. 32; 377
C. 4.6: 378
C. 4.10: 284 n. 127

- C.* 4.13: 350
C. 4.15: 377
C. 4.15.1: 325
Epist. 1.5.19: 326
Epist. 1.19.3: 325
Epist. 1.19.39f.: 323
Epist. 2.1.1f.: 395
Epist. 2.1.50ff: 128 n. 6
Epist. 2.1.118: 320
Epist. 2.1.124: 320
Epist. 2.1.225: 113 n. 73
Epist. 2.1.250ff.: 343
Epist. 2.1.258–59: 333 n. 21
Epist. 2.2: 362 n. 49
Epist. 2.2.91ff.: 362 n. 49
Epist. 2.2.92–101: 330
Epist. 2.2.100f.: 341
Epist. 2.2.102: 320
Epo. 6.11f.: 257 n. 40
Epo. 9: 198
Epo. 11.7f.: 293 n. 154
Epo. 15.14: 256 n. 38
Epo. 16.2: 344
Epo. 16.58: 132
Sat. 1: 391 n. 188
Sat. 1.2.37–134: 189; 292 n. 150
Sat. 1.2.101f.: 345
Sat. 1.2.105ff.: 114 n. 77
Sat. 1.2.119ff.: 114 n. 77; 319
 n. 3
Sat. 1.2.120–122: 344
Sat. 1.4.73: 330
Sat. 1.5: 391 n. 188
Sat. 1.9.43ff.: 336
Sat. 1.10.36f.: 74 n. 14
Sat. 1.10.40ff.: 128 n. 6
Sat. 1.10.74–77: 272 n. 90
Sat. 1.10.92: 391 n. 188
Sat. 2.1.12f.: 333 n. 21
Sat. 2.5.41: 74 n. 14
- Hymni Homerici
 h. Ven. 75–201: 312 n. 204
 h. Ven. 218–238: 283 n. 124
- Inc. trag. 206–208 R.: 345
- Isocrates
 Hel. Enc. 57: 332
- Iuvenalis
 6: 195 n. 21; 347
 6.535f.: 312 n. 205
 9.54: 52
- Lactantius
 Inst. 1.18.10: 216 n. 57
- Leonidas Tarentinus
 Anth. Pal. 9.337: 114; 344
 Anth. Pal. 5.188: 269; 272 n. 87
- Livius
 1.10: 391
 1.10.5: 392 n. 194
 1.11: 371
 1.21.3: 370
 1.28.11: 346
 4.20: 391
 34.2.2: 198 n. 26
- Lucanus
 1.72: 344
- Lucilius
 1271 M.: 331
- Lucretius
 3.978–1023: 282
 4.1121ff.: 344; 349
- Lycophron
 1281f.: 360 n. 40
 1226ff.: 124
- Lysias
 3.37: 203
- Macrobius
 Sat. 5.17: 339
 Sat. 5.18: 339
- Martialis
 7.99.7: 133 n. 27
 8.73.5: 226 with n. 41
 8.73.6: 142
 8.73.8: 133 n. 27
 14.100.1: 133 n. 27
 14.152.1: 133 n. 27
 14.189: 28; 199; 221 with n. 11;
 226; 292 n. 152
- Meleager
 Anth. Pal. 4.1.1ff.: 108 n. 51
 Anth. Pal. 4.1.15: 104
 Anth. Pal. 5.24: 256 n. 37
 Anth. Pal. 5.79.9f.: 269
 Anth. Pal. 5.139f.: 253 n. 24
 Anth. Pal. 5.156: 276 n. 101
 Anth. Pal. 5.172: 348 n. 41
 Anth. Pal. 5.177: 269
 Anth. Pal. 5.178: 269
 Anth. Pal. 5.180: 269
 Anth. Pal. 5.184: 256 n. 37
 Anth. Pal. 5.190: 269; 276 n. 101
 Anth. Pal. 5.215.5f.: 269
 Anth. Pal. 12.101: 326

- Anth. Pal.* 12.65: 253 n. 27
Anth. Pal. 12.70: 253 n. 27
Anth. Pal. 12.101: 107; 235
Anth. Pal. 12.101.3f.: 316 n. 213
Anth. Pal. 12.157: 276 n. 101
Anth. Pal. 12.167: 276 n. 101
- Mimnermus
 Fr. 1: 73
- Moschus
Anth. Pal. 9.440.16f.: 269 n. 79
Anth. Pal. 9.449: 269
- Nemesianus
 4.65: 302
- Nicander
 fr. 48: 108
- Ovidius
AA 1.55–100: 290
AA 1.295f.: 191
AA 1.536–37: 342
AA 3.333: 332
AA 3.335f.: 132 n. 17
AA 3.537: 143 n. 53
AA 3.579–584: 275 n. 98
Am. 1.1–5: 423
Am. 1.1: 79; 336
Am. 1.1.20: 423
Am. 1.1.27: 423
Am. 1.2.1f.: 423
Am. 1.2.9f.: 423
Am. 1.2.23–46: 275 n. 99
Am. 1.2.29: 423
Am. 1.3.1f.: 423
Am. 1.3.17f.: 160 n. 18
Am. 1.3.19f.: 423
Am. 1.5.9f.: 423
Am. 1.8.39f.: 195 n. 21
Am. 1.8.73f.: 275 n. 98
Am. 1.9: 158
Am. 1.9.1–2: 342
Am. 1.9.44: 261 n. 53
Am. 1.10.10: 168
Am. 1.13.3: 348 n. 41
Am. 1.14.1: 205 n. 24
Am. 1.15: 115 n. 78
Am.: 1.15.10ff.: 426
Am. 1.15.9–30: 128 n. 6
Am. 1.15.29f.: 143; 318 n. 224
Am. 2.1: 79
Am. 2.6: 336
Am. 2.9.42: 165
Am. 2.10: 290
Am. 2.10.35f.: 162 n. 22
Am. 2.13: 301 n. 177
Am. 2.17.12: 168
Am. 3.1: 79
Am. 3.6: 100 n. 11
Am. 3.9: 336; 426
Am. 3.9.33f.: 312 n. 205
Am. 3.9.61ff.: 132 n. 17
Am. 3.9.62: 133 n. 27
Am. 3.11.35f.: 63f.
Am. 3.11.48: 168
Am. 3.15: 363
Fast. 1.19–96: 195 n. 21
Fast. 2.303ff.: 389 n. 176
Fast. 3.259ff.: 366
Fast. 5.145: 359 n. 32
Fast. 6.409: 366
Her. 3: 190
Her. 3.3f.: 367 n. 72
Her. 9.53ff.: 389 n. 176
Her. 15.121: 293 n. 153
Her. 15.133: 282 n. 121
Met. 1.632: 132
Met. 2.328: 333 n. 21
Met. 4.678f.: 278 n. 107
Met. 5.469: 256 n. 36
Met. 7.7–158: 132 n. 22
Met. 7.158: 132
Met. 7.801: 253 n. 27
Met. 12.545: 55 n. 27
Met. 13.132f.: 204
Met. 14.51: 256 n. 36
Met. 14.643ff.: 119 n. 94
Rem. 247: 282 n. 122
Rem. 373ff.: 340
Rem. 533: 282 n. 122
Rem. 632: 282 n. 122
Rem. 385f.: 342
Trist. 1.6.1: 76
Trist. 2: 77
Trist. 2.439f.: 83; 132 n. 17
Trist. 2.465: 48
Trist. 4.10: 363
Trist. 4.10.45–48: 223 n. 29
Trist. 4.10.45: 337; 403f.
Trist. 4.10.47: 102 n. 22
Trist. 4.10.49–50: 330
Trist. 4.10.51–54: 226 with n. 38
Trist. 4.10.53: 138 n. 38
Trist. 5.1.17: 48
- Parthenius
Er. Path. 21: 120 with n. 97
Er. Path. 22: 120 n. 97

- Paulus Silentarius
Anth. Pal. 5.275.: 239
Anth. Pal. 5.301: 306 n. 187
- Pausanias
 7.21.3: 98
- Petronius
 126.18: 253 n. 27
- Phanocles
 fr. 1 Powell: 108 n. 56
 fr. 1.1f. Powell: 139
 n. 39
 fr. 5 Powell: 101 n. 5
- Philetas
 fr. 25 Spanoudakis (10 Powell): 104
 n. 38
SH 673–674: 104
- Philodemus
Anth. Pal. 9.570.1: 341
Anth. Pal. 11.44: 349
Anth. Pal. 5.4.5: 276 n. 103
Anth. Pal. 5.46: 292 n. 150
Anth. Pal. 5.123: 239 n. 69
Anth. Pal. 5.123.1–2: 319 n. 3
De poem. 5, p. 137 (Mangoni): 319
 with n. 1
- Philostratus
Imag. 1.16.3: 423 n. 29
- Pindarus
Isth. 6.74: 321; 325
Nem. 1: 321
Nem. 4.14: 342
Nem. 7.24: 323
Ol. 2.85: 342
Ol. 2.86: 325
Ol. 3.4–9: 327
Ol. 6.3f.: 322
Ol. 9.100: 325
Ol. 10.3f.: 321
Ol. 13.49: 321
Pae. VIIb.11: 324
Parth. 1.5f.: 321
Py. 4: 321
Py. 6: 321
Py. 10.54: 328
- Plato
Rep. 1.329c 4: 332
Rep. 2.359d–369a: 334
Rep. 10.596d 9–10: 335
Symp. 180b4: 424
Symp. 194e: 203 n. 16
- Symp.* 196e1f: 424
Symp. 202c2–7: 424
Symp. 203d8: 424
Theaet. 200d–201c: 205
- Plautus
Aul. 585–86: 206 n. 25
Curc. 167: 278 n. 112
Most. 157ff.: 373 n. 104
Pers. 1–5: 294 n. 157
Pers. 231–233: 158
Poen. 210ff.: 373 n. 104
Truc. 758–769: 256
- Plinius maior
N.H. 36.33f.: 345 n. 36
- Plinius minor
Epist. 5.3.5: 135 n. 32
Epist. 9.22: 35
- Plutarchus
An seni 15.791E: 336 n. 28
De Pyth. or. 404A: 388 n. 169
Num. 131: 366
Rom. 17: 371
- Posidippus
Anth. Pal. 12.45: 114; 264 n. 63; 272
 n. 87
Anth. Pal. 12.168: 103 n. 25
SH 704.9–15: 105 n. 42
- Probus
ad Verg. Ecl. 3.62: 110 n. 64
ad Verg. Ecl. 10.50: 99 n. 10
- Propertius
 1.1–2: 238
 1.1: 28; 89; 147f.; 271 n. 84; 294;
 423
 1.1.1–4: 107; 113
 1.1.1: 165; 167; 220 + 220 n. 10;
 238; 250 n. 18
 1.1.3f.: 306
 1.1.7: 153; 155; 320
 1.1.9–16: 148
 1.1.10: 184
 1.1.17–18: 148; 208
 1.1.17: 149
 1.1.19: 154
 1.1.22: 155; 290 n. 143
 1.1.26–35: 250 n. 15
 1.1.26: 153
 1.1.27: 153
 1.1.33–38: 148
 1.1.34–38: 149
 1.1.35–38: 296 n. 162

- 1.1.35: 153
 1.1.61–62: 161
 1.2: 148f.; 184; 204f.; 205 n. 24;
 235; 284
 1.2.1–2: 34
 1.2.7: 205
 1.2.8: 149
 1.2.9: 205
 1.2.16: 322
 1.2.27–30: 235 n. 58; 253 n. 24
 1.3: 187; 205; 237–243; 258; 304f.;
 306 n. 184
 1.3.1f: 422 n. 28
 1.3.5–9: 161
 1.3.7f: 422 n. 28
 1.3.7: 304 n. 181
 1.3.11–13: 241 n. 73
 1.3.15–18: 304
 1.3.16: 160 n. 15
 1.3.19–26: 130
 1.3.31f: 319 n. 3
 1.3.35–38: 205
 1.3.35f: 304 n. 181
 1.3.37–44: 304 n. 181
 1.3.40: 205
 1.4: 184; 249; 289; 297
 1.4.3f: 249 n. 13
 1.4.18: 159
 1.4.4: 157; 296 n. 161
 1.4.5–6: 190
 1.4.9–14: 271 n. 84
 1.4.11: 155
 1.5: 89; 184; 293
 1.5.3–6: 250 n. 15
 1.5.3: 155
 1.5.4: 153
 1.5.8: 8 n. 18
 1.5.11–22: 255 n. 34
 1.5.11: 167
 1.5.19f: 296 n. 161
 1.5.19: 157
 1.5.21–22: 155; 211 n. 36; 290
 n. 143
 1.5.24: 149
 1.5.28: 153; 209
 1.5.31–32: 209
 1.5.31: 86 n. 33
 1.6: 197 n. 23; 239; 368
 1.6.5: 215
 1.6.6: 155
 1.6.25: 293 n. 154
 1.6.27–28: 160
 1.6.29–30: 158; 261
 1.7/1.9: 35; 307; 315
 1.7: 103; 149f.; 169f.; 184; 207
 n. 27; 209; 212
 1.7.1–8: 207
 1.7.1–3: 322
 1.7.5–14: 235 n. 58
 1.7.5–8: 169; 250 n. 15; 296 n. 161
 1.7.6: 250 n. 18
 1.7.9–10: 169; 261 n. 54
 1.7.11: 169; 269 n. 76; 272 n. 88
 1.7.13–14: 149
 1.7.13: 147; 250 n. 17
 1.7.14: 153
 1.7.15–20: 207
 1.7.20f: 152
 1.7.20: 149
 1.7.22: 169
 1.7.23–24: 170
 1.7.25: 150
 1.7.26: 102; 149
 1.8: 33; 35; 58; 84; 86; 142; 184;
 279; 297; 298 with n. 167; 299
 1.8a: 205f.; 239; 367; 368
 1.8a1: 206
 1.8b: 205f.
 1.8.6f: 84
 1.8.7f: 297 n. 166
 1.8.27f: 297 n. 164
 1.8.27f: 299 n. 170
 1.8.27: 58
 1.8.31–42: 280 n. 116
 1.8.39–42: 170; 235 n. 58
 1.8.39: 272 n. 88
 1.8b40: 206
 1.8.43–46: 249 n. 13
 1.9: 103; 149f.; 169f.; 175; 184; 212;
 354
 1.9.1–8: 296 n. 162
 1.9.1–4: 157
 1.9.3: 212
 1.9.5–7: 149f.
 1.9.5–6: 98; 152
 1.9.7: 212
 1.9.9–12: 170
 1.9.11–12: 150; 272 n. 88
 1.9.11: 73; 325
 1.9.12: 37
 1.9.14: 102; 212
 1.9.15: 212
 1.9.19–24: 250 n. 15
 1.9.27–28: 167
 1.9.33f: 150
 1.10/13: 35
 1.10: 89; 168; 185; 239
 1.10.5–6: 162; 168

- 1.10.5: 86 n. 33
 1.10.15–20: 150; 209
 1.10.18: 153
 1.10.27–30: 157
 1.11/12: 33; 35; 239
 1.11: 58; 184
 1.11.5: 8 n. 19
 1.11.7–8: 208; 235 n. 58
 1.11.7: 159
 1.11.11: 7 n. 16
 1.11.21: 285 n. 130
 1.12: 41; 58
 1.12.5: 36
 1.12.16: 37
 1.12.18: 157
 1.12.19–20: 186; 226; 249 n. 13;
 260 n. 49
 1.12.20: 345
 1.13: 89; 168; 185
 1.13.2: 86 n. 33
 1.13.4: 86 n. 33
 1.13.7: 155
 1.13.13–14: 212
 1.13.15–18: 168
 1.13.16: 86 n. 33
 1.13.19–20: 155
 1.13.21: 197 n. 22
 1.13.22: 185
 1.13.31: 189
 1.13.24: 7 n. 16; 185
 1.13.29–30: 189
 1.14: 27
 1.14.8: 37; 149
 1.14.14: 160
 1.14.17–18: 184
 1.14.20: 27
 1.15: 213; 264; 265; 293; 354
 1.15.1f.: 250 n. 15
 1.15.9–20: 64
 1.15.9–16: 283
 1.15.9–14: 264 n. 61; 288 n. 141
 1.15.13: 185
 1.15.15–16: 33
 1.15.21: 163
 1.15.24: 268 n. 75
 1.15.33–38: 281 n. 119
 1.15.33–34: 167
 1.15.39: 155
 1.15.41: 151; 167
 1.16: 368
 1.16.9: 186 n. 5
 1.16.11: 186
 1.16.17–46: 186
 1.16.29–32: 206
 1.16.38: 51 n. 24
 1.17–19: 239
 1.17: 161
 1.17.13f.: 314 n. 209
 1.17.15f.: 296 n. 161
 1.17.19–24: 161
 1.17.22–24: 271
 1.17.25–28: 300 n. 174
 1.18: 85; 86; 89; 106
 1.18.1–4: 139
 1.18.16: 32
 1.18.19–20: 106f.; 214
 1.18.21–22: 139
 1.18.22: 85
 1.18.31f.: 214 n. 46
 1.19: 162f.; 184; 271; 274; 293;
 380
 1.19.5–6: 166
 1.19.7–10: 163
 1.19.12: 300
 1.19.13: 189
 1.19.13–16: 311 n. 203
 1.19.19: 163
 1.19.24: 208
 1.19.25–26: 260 n. 49; 277 n. 106
 1.20: 86; 86 n. 32; 108–110; 133
 1.20.1: 39; 86 n. 33
 1.20.5: 109
 1.20.6: 108
 1.20.12: 109; 110 n. 62
 1.20.14: 86 n. 33
 1.20.15–16: 101
 1.20.17: 108
 1.20.22: 120
 1.20.31: 108
 1.20.32: 109
 1.20.33ff. 109 n. 59
 1.20.43: 109 n. 61
 1.20.45: 110 n. 62
 1.20.51: 39; 86 n. 33
 1.21f.: 28
 1.21: 12 n. 38; 160; 365 n. 61
 1.21.3: 168
 1.21.7: 86 n. 33
 1.21.9f.: 365 n. 61
 1.21.10: 40
 1.22: 160; 247 n. 7; 363; 365 n. 61
 2.1: 79; 175; 225; 246–251; 380
 2.1.1–4: 221 with n. 13; 224; 235
 n. 58
 2.1.1: 29; 57
 2.1.2: 29
 2.1.3f.: 105; 142; 170; 272 n. 88
 2.1.4: 266; 308

- 2.1.5–16: 171
 2.1.5–14: 57 n. 37
 2.1.5–8: 271 n. 84
 2.1.5–6: 106
 2.1.5: 247 n. 7
 2.1.9–14: 149
 2.1.11: 167; 252 n. 21
 2.1.12: 57; 105f.; 110 n. 65
 2.1.14: 57
 2.1.15–22: 149
 2.1.15–16: 37; 57 n. 37
 2.1.16: 57 n. 37
 2.1.24: 424
 2.1.25: 325
 2.1.27: 248 n. 10
 2.1.29: 248 n. 10
 2.1.38: 61f.
 2.1.39–42: 171; 316 n. 215; 322
 2.1.39–40: 110
 2.1.40: 321
 2.1.45: 111; 159; 249 n. 11
 2.1.47: 132; 160
 2.1.51–54: 191
 2.1.53f.: 132
 2.1.54: 7 n. 16
 2.1.55–56: 161
 2.1.56: 293
 2.1.57: 153
 2.1.58: 39; 153
 2.1.63: 11; 40
 2.1.64–2.21.2: 41
 2.1.71: 272
 2.1.78: 161; 174
 2.2: 251f.
 2.2.1: 27
 2.2.2: 160 n. 15
 2.2.5: 52
 2.2.9: 190
 2.2.12: 190
 2.3: 175; 252–254
 2.3.1–4: 221 with n. 14; 224; 235 n. 58
 2.3.3f.: 171
 2.3.4: 30; 175; 293 n. 154
 2.3.7: 151f.; 171
 2.3.14–22: 167
 2.3.17–22: 171
 2.3.21: 42
 2.3.22: 32; 42; 108 n. 54
 2.3.24: 31; 51
 2.3.25: 171; 173; 268
 2.3.26: 187
 2.3.32: 190
 2.3.38: 172
 2.3.43f.: 59; 143
 2.3.45–54: 8 n. 20
 2.3.45: 254 n. 30
 2.3.46: 254 n. 31
 2.3.53: 255 n. 33
 2.4: 151f.; 254–256
 2.4.1ff.: 296 n. 161
 2.4.4: 255 n. 34
 2.4.6: 293 n. 154
 2.4.7–13: 154
 2.4.7: 191
 2.4.10: 153
 2.4.13: 151; 162
 2.4.14: 151
 2.4.15f.: 255 n. 35
 2.4.20: 256 n. 36
 2.5: 256f.
 2.5.5f.: 268 n. 75
 2.5.9f.: 31
 2.6: 187; 193; 258–260
 2.6.3: 187 n. 8
 2.6.9: 187
 2.6.11f.: 187
 2.6.21f.: 151
 2.6.23: 190
 2.6.25f.: 191
 2.6.25: 193
 2.6.27f.: 187
 2.6.31f.: 259 n. 46
 2.6.41f.: 64 n. 63; 249 n. 13; 260 n. 49; 261 n. 51
 2.7: 260–261
 2.7.7f.: 164 n. 27
 2.7.8: 261 n. 51
 2.7.14–16: 159
 2.7.19: 260 n. 49
 2.8: 163f.; 261–263
 2.8.11: 235 n. 58
 2.8.15: 157
 2.8.17: 219 n. 3
 2.8.21: 190
 2.8.29–38: 151
 2.8.40: 151
 2.9: 19; 187 n. 7; 191ff.; 213; 263–265; 368; 380
 2.9.2–16: 283
 2.9.3–8: 242
 2.9.3–6: 190
 2.9.9–16: 190
 2.9.17: 188; 191
 2.9.21f.: 288 n. 140
 2.9.23f.: 188
 2.9.31–33: 191
 2.9.31: 213

- 2.9.33–36: 192; 193
 2.9.36–37: 213
 2.9.37–40: 114
 2.9.41–52: 265 n. 67
 2.10: 14; 19; 36; 172f.; 175; 212;
 266–268
 2.10.1–4: 172
 2.10.1: 186
 2.10.5f.: 327; 333 n. 21; 361; 425
 2.10.7f.: 57 n. 33
 2.10.8: 57 n. 33; 172
 2.10.9: 210
 2.10.10: 57 n. 33
 2.10.12: 172
 2.10.15: 336; 351
 2.10.19f.: 172; 341 n. 32; 361
 2.10.19: 57 n. 33; 320
 2.10.21f.: 352
 2.10.22: 8 n. 19
 2.10.25: 174
 2.11: 19; 173f.; 268f.
 2.11.1: 57 n. 33; 173
 2.11.2–6: 173
 2.11.6: 57 n. 33; 307 n. 189
 2.11.13: 57 n. 33
 2.11.22f.: 268 n. 73
 2.12: 172; 269–271; 273 n. 93
 2.12.6: 270 n. 82
 2.12.10: 270 n. 83
 2.12.12: 156
 2.12.21: 57 n. 33
 2.12.22: 57 n. 33
 2.12.24: 48 n. 13; 57 n. 33
 2.13: 29; 59 with n. 41; 174f.;
 271–274; 293; 380
 2.13b: 425
 2.13.1f.: 264 n. 63
 2.13.11–12: 337
 2.13.11: 269 n. 76
 2.13.12: 57 n. 33
 2.13a14: 212
 2.13.15f.: 59
 2.13.17f.: 161
 2.13.17: 30
 2.13.19–23: 30
 2.13.25–26: 14; 56; 174; 221 with
 n. 15
 2.13.25: 30
 2.13.31–32: 136
 2.13.35–6: 161
 2.13.35: 29
 2.13.36: 156; 249 n. 13; 296 n. 161
 2.13.39f.: 271
 2.13.42: 278 n. 111
 2.13.48: 274 n. 96
 2.13.51–58: 136f.
 2.14: 35; 274–276
 2.14.1: 31
 2.14.3: 31
 2.14.10: 162
 2.14.17–20: 165
 2.14.18: 155
 2.14.27: 219 n. 3
 2.15: 35; 276–279
 2.15.11f.: 165
 2.15.12: 164
 2.15.17–20: 257 n. 40
 2.15.23f.: 165
 2.15.29: 155
 2.15.31–36: 249 n. 13
 2.15.35: 278 n. 110
 2.15.37: 278 n. 112
 2.15.39: 162
 2.15.41f.: 307
 2.15.44: 35
 2.16: 188; 208; 225; 279–281; 310;
 380
 2.16.11f.: 188
 2.16.17–18: 188
 2.16.21: 188
 2.16.23f.: 188 n. 9
 2.16.31–42: 281 n. 118
 2.16.37–42: 198
 2.16.43f.: 188
 2.17: 282–283
 2.17.15: 282 n. 123
 2.18: 8 n. 20; 33; 59 n. 41; 187 n. 7
 2.18a: 283–284
 2.18b: 59 n. 41; 284f.
 2.18.1–4: 192
 2.18.7–18: 190
 2.18.9f.: 122 n. 105
 2.18.10: 8 n. 19
 2.18.21–22: 148
 2.18c.28: 208
 2.18.29: 284 n. 129
 2.18.33f.: 187
 2.19: 84; 285–286; 310; 416
 2.19.3: 37
 2.19.17f.: 85; 286 n. 131
 2.20: 286–288
 2.20.1: 190; 293
 2.20.5–8: 190
 2.20.8: 8 n. 19; 101
 2.20.9–12: 190
 2.20.14–17: 53
 2.20.17f.: 278 n. 111
 2.20.20: 157

- 2.20.25f.: 280 n. 116
 2.20.31: 286 n. 133
 2.20.34–36: 260 n. 49
 2.20.35: 53
 2.21–25: 188f.; 192
 2.21–24: 383
 2.21: 34; 288–289
 2.21.3: 41; 152
 2.21.11–12: 191
 2.21.11: 132 n. 21
 2.21.15f.: 192
 2.21.19f.: 260 n. 49
 2.22a–24: 381
 2.22: 27; 33; 34; 59 n. 41; 188;
 289–291
 2.22.1: 27
 2.22.7: 156; 166
 2.22.13f.: 151
 2.22.17f.: 250 n. 16
 2.22.21: 36; 155
 2.22.28: 151
 2.22.43–50: 62; 188
 2.22.44: 53
 2.22.48: 290 n. 145
 2.22.50: 290 n. 145
 2.23: 187 n. 7; 188; 291–293
 2.23.1–10: 207f.
 2.23.1f.: 64 n. 63
 2.23.12ff.: 319 n. 3
 2.23.21f.: 64 n. 63
 2.23.23f.: 64 n. 63; 157
 2.24: 33; 59 n. 41; 187 n. 7;
 293–295
 2.24a: 59 n. 41
 2.24a.1–6: 188
 2.24.1f.: 220 with n. 10
 2.24.4: 293 n. 153
 2.24.8: 293 n. 155
 2.24.10: 189
 2.24a10: 208
 2.24.11–14: 280 n. 116
 2.24.2: 28
 2.24.17–22: 235 n. 58
 2.24.17ff.: 291
 2.24.33f.: 249 n. 13
 2.24.35f.: 271
 2.24.35: 219 n. 3
 2.24.38: 26
 2.24.41f.: 192
 2.24.43f.: 191
 2.24.47f.: 64; 295 n. 159
 2.24.49f.: 192
 2.24.51f.: 271
 2.25: 192f.; 295–297
 2.25.1–4: 129
 2.25.2: 8 n. 19
 2.25.3f.: 268 n. 75; 318 n. 225
 2.25.3: 174
 2.25.4: 135 n. 32
 2.25.9f.: 249 n. 13
 2.25.17: 296 n. 160
 2.25.21–34: 152
 2.25.22: 37; 192
 2.25.35: 193
 2.25.39–48: 166
 2.25.46: 156
 2.26: 334
 2.26a/b: 59 n. 41; 386
 2.26a: 99f.
 2.26b.53: 205
 2.26: 33; 297–300
 2.26.5: 190
 2.26.13f.: 167
 2.26.21f.: 158
 2.26.23–26: 280 n. 116
 2.26.27f.: 64; 299 n. 170
 2.26.39: 297 n. 164
 2.26.47–51: 190
 2.26.57f.: 162
 2.27: 59 n. 41; 300f.
 2.27.7: 300 n. 175
 2.27.15f.: 163
 2.28: 33; 59 with n. 41; 187 n. 7;
 298; 301–304
 2.28a: 206
 2.28.8: 192 n. 15
 2.28.9–12: 134
 2.28.17–28: 190f.
 2.28.27–30: 311 n. 203
 2.28.29: 189; 191 n. 14
 2.28.41f.: 164
 2.28.42: 249 n. 13; 278 n. 111
 2.28.49f.: 191 n. 14
 2.28.51–56: 311 n. 203
 2.28.51f.: 108 n. 54
 2.28.51: 197 n. 22
 2.28.53: 32; 42
 2.28.54: 7 n. 16
 2.29: 33; 239 n. 68; 304–306; 386
 2.29a/b: 59 n. 41; 189
 2.29a: 59 n. 41; 385 n. 155
 2.29b: 213
 2.29.23: 386
 2.29.28: 386
 2.29b.35–38: 213
 2.30: 8 n. 20; 33; 59 n. 41
 2.30a/b: 79
 2.30a: 306

- 2.30b: 213; 307f.
 2.30.1f.: 93
 2.30.1ff.: 85
 2.30b.13: 213
 2.30b.15: 213
 2.30.16–38: 268 n. 76
 2.30.16: 317
 2.30.19ff.: 74 n. 14
 2.30.23f.: 249 n. 13
 2.30.27–30: 259 n. 46
 2.31/32: 382 n. 141; 387
 2.31: 187 n. 8; 225; 247 n. 7; 308f.; 374
 2.31.1–16: 164
 2.31.3: 309 n. 196
 2.31.5: 309 n. 197
 2.32: 187 nn. 7, 8; 193–195; 309–312
 2.32.1f.: 167; 215
 2.32.3–14: 188
 2.32.6: 108 n. 54
 2.32.7: 310 n. 199
 2.32.9f.: 303 n. 179
 2.32.11–16: 308 n. 194
 2.32.11: 387
 2.32.23: 311 n. 201
 2.32.25f.: 311 n. 202
 2.32.40: 7 n. 16
 2.32.47: 195
 2.32.57: 191
 2.32.62: 195
 2.33: 33; 59 n. 41; 312–314
 2.33.1f.: 303 with n. 179
 2.33a.11f.: 134
 2.33b.23: 215
 2.33.33–34: 64 n. 62
 2.33.37: 29
 2.33.41f.: 151f.
 2.34: 33; 34; 59 n. 41; 77; 94; 103; 192 n. 15; 225; 235; 315–318; 427
 2.34.1–58: 272 n. 88
 2.34.1f.: 104
 2.34.1: 315 n. 210
 2.34.3–6: 152
 2.34.3: 37
 2.34.8: 132f.; 132 n. 21
 2.34.13f.: 164 n. 28
 2.34.15f.: 213 n. 40
 2.34.19f.: 53
 2.34.24: 156
 2.34.25: 315 n. 211
 2.34.31f.: 104; 175; 316 n. 215
 2.34.32: 111 n. 68
 2.34.33–38: 162
 2.34.37f.: 102
 2.34.43: 104
 2.34.45: 102
 2.34.47–50: 62; 316 n. 216
 2.34.51–54: 195
 2.34.51–54: 316 n. 216
 2.34.51f.: 162
 2.34.57: 307
 2.34.59–66: 137
 2.34.61–66: 174
 2.34.61: 317 n. 217
 2.34.65f.: 34
 2.34.66: 350
 2.34.67–84: 34; 137f.
 2.34.67–76: 62 n. 56; 184 n. 2
 2.34.77–80: 62; 62 n. 56; 424
 2.34.79: 269 n. 76
 2.34.83f.: 318 n. 220
 2.34b.85–94: 128f.
 2.34.91f.: 97f.; 142
 2.34.92: 156
 2.34.93f.: 174; 235 n. 58; 249 n. 13; 268 n. 75
 2.34.93: 219 n. 3; 318 n. 221
 3.1: 26; 79; 335; 340; 362 n. 49; 375
 3.1.1–8: 316 n. 215
 3.1.1–6: 94; 178
 3.1–5: 340
 3.1.1–4: 175f.; 425 n. 43
 3.1–3: 111–113; 362; 377
 3.1f.: 58
 3.1.1: 104; 105; 111; 322 n. 5
 3.1.3: 320f.; 328; 342
 3.1.4: 328
 3.1.5: 113 n. 73; 316 n. 215
 3.1.7–9: 176
 3.1.8: 113 n. 73; 316 n. 215; 325
 3.1.9–14: 275 n. 99
 3.1.9f.: 111; 323
 3.1.12–14: 112
 3.1.14–18: 316 n. 215
 3.1.14: 111; 338
 3.1.16: 333
 3.1.18: 111
 3.1.19: 322 n. 5
 3.1.21: 111; 325
 3.1.29: 32; 328
 3.1.30: 329
 3.1.35f.: 272 n. 91
 3.1.38: 320
 3.2: 79; 338; 340f.; 375
 3.2.1–10: 272 n. 88

- 3.2.1f.: 195
 3.2.2: 176
 3.2.3–6: 242
 3.2.9–20: 266 n. 70
 3.2.9f.: 377
 3.2.9: 340
 3.2.10: 323
 3.2.13: 7 n. 16
 3.2.15–18: 235 n. 58
 3.2.16: 349; 378 n. 129
 3.2.17–26: 268
 3.2.17f.: 175; 195
 3.2.19–26: 272 n. 91
 3.2.25f.: 342
 3.3: 79; 176f.; 179; 307; 341; 375;
 378 n. 129
 3.3.1–4: 50
 3.3.1f.: 111f.
 3.3.2: 177
 3.3.3: 322 n. 5
 3.3.4: 329
 3.3.5ff.: 361
 3.3.5: 177
 3.3.17: 219 n. 3
 3.3.18: 113
 3.3.19f.: 149
 3.3.21ff.: 364 n. 57
 3.3.21: 52
 3.3.31: 323
 3.3.32: 42
 3.3.33: 8 n. 19
 3.3.38: 349
 3.3.39ff.: 74 n. 14
 3.3.42: 8 n. 19; 51
 3.3.52: 104; 316 n. 215
 3.4: 88; 177; 251 n. 19; 341; 377;
 378; 427
 3.4.1–10: 266 n. 70
 3.4.1: 53; 321; 351
 3.4.7: 322 n. 5
 3.4.9f.: 377
 3.4.10: 342
 3.4.22: 251 n. 19; 377
 3.5: 177; 178; 251 n. 19; 341f.; 427
 3.5.1–12: 279 n. 113
 3.5.1f.: 53
 3.5.14: 52
 3.5.21: 307; 346
 3.5.47f.: 266 n. 70; 377;
 3.6–8: 342
 3.6: 189; 195; 213; 342f.
 3.6.5–18: 213
 3.6.9: 329
 3.6.19–34: 287 n. 134
 3.6.27: 52
 3.6.30: 51
 3.6.39: 213 n. 44
 3.7: 8 n. 20; 343
 3.7.8: 37
 3.7.11: 36
 3.7.21f.: 101
 3.7.42: 36
 3.7.60: 52
 3.8: 195; 206; 337; 343
 3.8.1–12: 192 n. 15
 3.8.1–10: 257 n. 40
 3.8.1: 329
 3.8.11ff.: 383
 3.8.11: 8 n. 19
 3.8.13: 42
 3.8.17f.: 153
 3.8.17: 206
 3.8.19–20: 153
 3.8.19: 51
 3.8.25f.: 64 n. 63
 3.8.27: 40
 3.8.28: 155; 192 n. 15
 3.8.29: 50; 328; 329
 3.8.31–34: 159
 3.8.31: 274 n. 96
 3.8.33: 328
 3.8.35–36: 64 n. 63
 3.8.37: 31; 32
 3.9–16: 343
 3.9: 115; 177; 337; 343f.; 362
 3.9.1: 365 n. 61
 3.9.3: 247 n. 5; 322 n. 5; 338
 3.9.9–16: 164; 308 n. 194
 3.9.16: 51
 3.9.23ff.: 113
 3.9.28: 329
 3.9.29: 113
 3.9.33f.: 61f.
 3.9.35–46: 316 n. 215
 3.9.43f.: 177
 3.9.43: 343
 3.9.44: 104
 3.9.45f.: 105; 343f.
 3.9.47f.: 113; 361
 3.9.49–51: 361
 3.9.52: 247 n. 6; 361
 3.9.57: 51
 3.10: 195; 344
 3.10.1–4: 177
 3.10.1: 50
 3.10.15: 219 n. 3
 3.11: 196–198; 344
 3.11.2: 198

- 3.11.9–12: 191
 3.11.9: 132 n. 21; 402
 3.11.14: 42
 3.11.23: 51
 3.11.27f.: 197
 3.11.29: 198
 3.11.32: 197f.
 3.11.33–58: 198
 3.11.39f.: 347
 3.11.39: 198
 3.11.49: 198
 3.11.51: 32
 3.11.66: 342; 344 n. 33
 3.12: 190; 195f.; 344; 366f.
 3.12.1: 329
 3.12.5: 196
 3.12.14: 32
 3.13: 198; 247 n. 7; 344
 3.13.9: 32
 3.13.11–14: 198
 3.13.11f.: 345 n. 34
 3.13.15–22: 163
 3.13.23–24: 37
 3.13.25–46: 259 n. 48; 297 n. 163;
 317
 3.13.25–40: 184 n. 2
 3.13.25–30: 114
 3.13.30: 51
 3.13.35: 8 n. 19; 51 n. 24
 3.13.34–40: 311 n. 204
 3.13.38: 277 n. 105
 3.13.41: 344
 3.13.42: 51
 3.13.43–46: 34; 108 n. 51;
 114
 3.13.59: 320; 352 n. 43
 3.13.65: 320; 352 n. 43
 3.14: 27; 214; 345
 3.14.4: 277 n. 105
 3.14.15f.: 34
 3.14.19f.: 277 n. 105
 3.15: 345f.
 3.15.1–12: 226 n. 40
 3.15.10: 157
 3.15.11: 33
 3.15.44: 192 n. 15
 3.15.46: 271
 3.16: 195; 346
 3.16.1–4: 427
 3.16.11f.: 155
 3.16.13f.: 31
 3.16.14: 32
 3.16.23–30: 273 n. 92
 3.16.23f.: 271
 3.17–24: 346
 3.17: 177f.; 346; 378
 3.17.3: 156
 3.17.4: 153
 3.17.6: 250 n. 16
 3.17.10: 153
 3.17.15–18: 34
 3.17.24: 51
 3.17.39f.: 177
 3.17.40: 321
 3.18: 346f.
 3.18.9: 334
 3.18.14: 51 n. 24
 3.18.19: 51 n. 24
 3.18.24: 40
 3.18.25f.: 349
 3.19: 196–198; 213f.; 347
 3.19.4: 198
 3.19.7: 192 n. 15
 3.19.12: 39
 3.19.18: 191
 3.20: 196; 213; 348f.
 3.20.8: 42
 3.21: 273 n. 93; 339; 349
 3.21.3f.: 166
 3.21.4: 152
 3.21.8: 8 n. 19; 51
 3.21.9f.: 167
 3.21.14: 30
 3.21.25: 51
 3.21.28: 269 n. 76
 3.21.29f.: 165
 3.21.32: 156
 3.21.33f.: 162
 3.22: 349
 3.22.1: 41
 3.23: 349
 3.23.1: 269 n. 76
 3.23.22: 51
 3.24/25: 58; 222; 227; 349f.; 364;
 381f.; 387
 3.24.355
 3.24.3: 332
 3.24.12: 38
 3.24.15: 276 n. 101
 3.24.18: 154; 156
 3.24.19: 156; 332
 3.25: 177; 355
 3.25.1f.: 293 n. 154
 3.25.1: 340
 3.25.3: 158; 296 n. 161
 3.25.9f.: 205 nn. 9, 10
 3.28.2: 8 n. 19
 4.1: 26; 58f.; 178f.; 362 n. 49

- 4.1a: 358–362; 364; 370; 373; 374;
 376 n. 122; 380; 391
 4.1b: 358; 358 n. 23; 362–364; 359;
 373; 376 n. 122; 380
 4.1.1–4: 117
 4.1.1: 362 n. 51
 4.1.3: 365 n. 61
 4.1.5: 366
 4.1.8: 365 n. 61
 4.1.20: 363 n. 54
 4.1.33ff.: 392
 4.1.34: 110 n. 67; 359 n. 33
 4.1.36: 359 n. 33
 4.1.46–50: 364 n. 57
 4.1.47f.: 360 nn. 39, 41
 4.1.49–54: 124f.
 4.1.51: 320
 4.1.55f.: 159
 4.1.57–60: 392 n. 193
 4.1.57f.: 362f.
 4.1.58–60: 178f.
 4.1.63–64: 178
 4.1.64: 94; 115; 323
 4.1.67–73: 362 n. 52
 4.1.67ff.: 358 n. 23
 4.1.69–70: 180
 4.1.69: 115; 119; 123; 359; 359
 n. 34
 4.1.71: 219 n. 3; 362 n. 50
 4.1.73: 12 n. 38; 363 n. 54
 4.1.81–88: 363 n. 53
 4.1.81–2: 54
 4.1.87–88: 179; 360 n. 39
 4.1.95: 86 n. 33
 4.1.119ff.: 392
 4.1.125f.: 365 n. 61
 4.1.125: 392 n. 193
 4.1.135–38: 159; 261 n. 53
 4.1.135: 179; 362 n. 49
 4.1.141: 4 n. 6
 4.1.142: 329
 4.2: 359 n. 34; 360; 365–366; 370;
 392; 393
 4.2.1f. 384
 4.2.12: 366 n. 64
 4.2.13–18: 365 n. 59
 4.4.13f.: 370 n. 88
 4.4.17f.: 370 n. 88
 4.2.35f.: 365 n. 59
 4.2.49f.: 365 n. 59
 4.2.51–54: 365 n. 59
 4.2.51f.: 118
 4.2.51: 416
 4.2.55f.: 365 n. 59
 4.2.59–62: 119
 4.3: 179; 196; 366–369; 372; 373;
 380; 393; 395 n. 204
 4.3.1–6: 367 n. 72
 4.3.23–28: 210
 4.3.27f.: 155
 4.3.37f.: 64 n. 63; 368 n. 78f.
 4.3.51–56.: 368 n. 77
 4.3.72: 367 n. 75
 4.4: 119; 120 n. 100; 359 n. 34;
 360; 370–372; 384
 4.4.3–8: 370 n. 88
 4.4.3ff.: 370 n. 87
 4.4.3: 375 n. 118
 4.4.7: 370
 4.4.13f.: 370 n. 88
 4.4.17f.: 64; 370 n. 88
 4.4.33–34: 53
 4.4.49–50: 54
 4.4.73–78: 371 n. 93
 4.4.74f.: 32
 4.4.83f.: 371 n. 93
 4.4.89–91: 120
 4.4.89f.: 110
 4.4.92: 64
 4.4.94: 64; 370 n. 89
 4.5: 372–373; 393
 4.5.6: 255 n. 34
 4.5.34: 331
 4.5.41f.: 191
 4.5.47f.: 31
 4.5.53: 187 n. 8
 4.5.55f.: 34; 63
 4.5.57f.: 34
 4.5.65–70: 214
 4.5.67f.: 154
 4.5.74: 51
 4.6: 36; 116f.; 179f.; 359 n. 34; 360;
 373–379; 380; 387
 4.6.1–10: 316 n. 215
 4.6.1: 33; 320
 4.6.3f.: 178
 4.6.3: 8 n. 19; 51, 104
 4.6.10: 116
 4.6.12: 341
 4.6.13ff.: 375 n. 115
 4.6.15–20: 376 n. 119
 4.6.25–27: 377 n. 126
 4.6.25f.: 117
 4.6.27f.: 376 n. 124
 4.6.28: 376 n. 120
 4.6.36: 51
 4.6.59: 346
 4.6.62: 347

4.6.67f.: 116
 4.6.67: 36
 4.6.69f.: 309
 4.6.72: 8 n. 19
 4.6.76: 361
 4.6.77: 35
 4.6.80–86: 377 n. 126
 4.7/4.8: 386
 4.7: 163; 344; 372; 379; 379–383;
 385; 386; 387; 393; 395
 4.7.21: 215
 4.7.57f.: 191
 4.7.57: 32
 4.7.40: 287 n. 134
 4.7.49f.: 235 n. 58
 4.7.49: 219 n. 3
 4.7.85f.: 161
 4.7.93f.: 271
 4.7.95f.: 383
 4.8: 372; 379; 380; 383–387; 389;
 389 n. 176
 4.8.3–14: 123
 4.8.3: 375 n. 118
 4.8.4: 50
 4.8.9: 384 n. 149
 4.8.10: 384 n. 149
 4.8.15: 51
 4.8.19ff.: 384 n. 151
 4.8.19f.: 64 n. 63
 4.8.28: 159
 4.8.31: 370 n. 87
 4.8.36: 123; 359 n. 28; 384
 n. 152
 4.8.39f. 384 n. 153
 4.8.48: 384 n. 154
 4.8.58: 54
 4.8.81–88: 385 n. 157
 4.9: 359 n. 34; 360; 375 n. 117;
 383 n. 144; 387–390
 4.9.1f.: 121
 4.9.3: 360
 4.9.17: 121 n. 102
 4.9.32–50: 206
 4.9.34: 8 n. 19
 4.9.42: 63
 4.9.45–50: 389 n. 176
 4.9.57: 122 n. 105
 4.9.65f.: 388 n. 170
 4.9.67–70: 121
 4.9.70–72: 388
 4.9.71f.: 122; 122 n. 104
 4.9.70: 388 n. 170
 4.9.74: 122 n. 104

4.10: 359 n. 34; 360; 370; 389;
 390–392
 4.10.18: 42
 4.10.25f.: 392 n. 192
 4.10.27–30: 123
 4.11: 124; 179; 186; 196; 215f.;
 379f.; 381 n. 140; 383 n. 147;
 392–395
 4.11.2f.: 393 n. 199
 4.11.3–4: 50
 4.11.6f.: 266 n. 69
 4.11.17–76: 39; 42
 4.11.18: 216
 4.11.27f.: 216
 4.11.47–49: 216
 4.11.67: 32
 4.11.73: 32
 4.11.93: 51 n. 23
 4.11.99: 216
 4.11.101f.: 357; 394f.

Longinus

De subl. 15.1f.: 426 n. 45

Quintilianus

Decl. min. 328.2: 214
Inst. 2.4.26: 206
Inst. 2.15: 201f. n. 9
Inst. 2.15.6–9: 201f. n. 9
Inst. 2.15.11: 201f. n. 9
Inst. 4.2.57: 202
Inst. 5.4.2: 213 n. 43
Inst. 6.2.32: 428 n. 45
Inst. 8.5: 215 n. 50
Inst. 9.2.29ff.: 357 n. 21
Inst. 10.1.58: 104; 175
Inst. 10.1.93: 48 n. 13; 406
Inst. 12.10.33: 328

[Quintilianus]

Decl. mai. 3.7: 203 n. 16
Decl. mai. 3.19: 203 n. 16

Sallustius

Cat. 25: 253 n. 25
Cat. 51.9: 203 n. 15

Sappho

fr. 1.28 *PLF*: 158

Seneca maior

Contr. 7, *praef.* 3: 203

Seneca philosophus

Epist. 108.34: 216 n. 57
Phoen. 443ff.: 265 n. 64
Const. Sap. 2.2: 344

- Servius
ad Verg. Aen. 3.274: 35
ad Verg. Aen. 8.704: 35
- Sidonius Apollinaris
Epist. 9.14. 4: 420 n. 24
- Simylus
SH 724: 120 n. 100
- Sophocles
Ant. 781: 158
El. 145–152: 287 n. 135
O.C. 1224–1228: 273 n. 95
O.T. 756: 205
O.T. 797: 205
Phil. 927–62: 214
Phil. 952: 214 n. 46
- Statius
Silv. 1.2.252ff.: 128 n. 6
Silv. 2.7.77f.: 74 n. 14
Silv. 5.1.43f.: 278 n. 107
Silv. 5.3.151–52: 327 n. 11
Theb. 11.315ff.: 265 n. 64
Theb. 11.442–3: 103 n. 21
- Suetonius
Aug. 28.3–29.4: 359 n. 35
Aug. 34: 260 n. 50
Aug. 89.1: 359
Cal. 57.4: 346
De gramm. 16: 320 n. 4
Vesp. 19: 216
- Tacitus
Ann. 3.33–34: 198 n. 26
Ann. 4.57.4: 198 n. 26
Dial. 14.2: 203 n. 15
Hist. 4.44: 198 n. 26
- Terentius
Eun. 45–73: 279 n. 114
Eun. 57–8: 184 n. 1
Eun. 583–90: 187
Heaut. 693: 278 n. 112
Hec. 419: 338
Hec. 843: 278 n. 112
- Theocritus (Ps.-Theocr.)
1.120–21: 161 n. 20
2: 72
2.23–26: 302 n. 178
3: 72
7.96: 253 n. 26
11: 86 n. 32; 139
11.1–6: 153 n. 5
11.76: 256 n. 38
11.80: 349
12: 72
13: 101
13.25ff.: 108
13.39ff.: 109 with n. 59
16.20: 340
20: 72
23: 72
25: 301
27.20: 306 n. 186
29: 72
30: 72
- Theognis
237–54: 75; 341
425–428: 273 n. 95
1286f.: 158
1303–6: 284 n. 127
- Thukydides
1.5.2: 74 n. 14
- Tibullus (Corpus Tibullianum)
1: 85–87
1.1: 285; 380; 418
1.1.6: 29
1.1.59–68: 160 n. 18
1.1.65f.: 162 n. 21
1.1.69f.: 277 n. 106
1.1.69: 165
1.1.73–75: 158f.
1.1.75f.: 158 n. 13; 368
1.1.75: 261 n. 53
1.2.27: 346
1.2.43–54: 373
1.3.23–26: 303 n. 179; 312 n. 205
1.3.55f.: 161
1.3.63f.: 158 n. 13
1.4: 335; 356 n. 16
1.4.9–72: 373
1.4.21–26: 281 n. 119
1.4.21–24: 193 n. 17
1.4.61: 269 n. 76
1.4.65f.: 268 n. 75
1.4.75f.: 162 n. 21
1.5: 285; 373
1.5.9–17: 264 n. 62
1.5.10–16: 302
1.5.29f.: 296 n. 161
1.5.47–66: 373
1.6.21f.: 389 n. 176
1.6.74: 215 n. 51
1.8: 93; 335
1.8.8f.: 255 n. 34

- 1.9: 93; 335
 1.9.11f.: 280 n. 115
 1.9.79f.: 256 n. 39
 1.10: 84; 279 n. 113; 418
 1.10.53–58: 158 n. 13
 1.10.57–67: 257 n. 41
 2.1: 180
 2.1.71–80: 158 n. 13
 2.2.17–20: 278 n. 107
 2.3.6: 373
 2.3.33–8: 158 n. 13
 2.3.44ff.: 373
 2.3.51–8: 373
 2.4.1–4: 296 n. 161
 2.4.39f.: 280 n. 115
 2.5.1: 328; 362
 2.5: 125 n. 111; 180; 357; 360; 374;
 375 n. 114
 2.5.12: 362; 362 n. 50
 2.5.22–64: 178; 358
 2.5.23–30: 358
 2.5.23ff.: 117 n. 90
 2.5.81–83: 302 n. 178
 2.5.87ff.: 358
 2.5.106: 158 n. 13
 2.5.109f.: 250 n. 15
 2.6.1–10: 158 n. 13
 3.2.11f.: 160 n. 18
 3.3.7f.: 160 n. 18
 3.4.73f.: 296 n. 161
 3.6.41: 133 n. 27; 269 n. 77
 3.10: 301 n. 177
 3.10.9–12: 302 n. 178
 3.11.15f.: 278 n. 107
 4.6.2: 269 n. 77
 Tigidas
 fr. 1 Morel: 276 n. 103
 Varro
 L.L. 5.41: 371
 L.L. 5.46: 365 n. 61
 Velleius Paterculus
 2.81.3: 374
 Vergilius
 Aen. 1.7: 322 n. 5
 Aen. 2.5: 334
 Aen. 2.792ff.: 380
 Aen. 4: 357 n. 19
 Aen. 4: 192 n. 15
 Aen. 4.338: 348
 Aen. 4.506: 329 n. 14
 Aen. 4.569f.: 192
 Aen. 6: 357 n. 19
 Aen. 4.383f.: 298 n. 167
 Aen. 5.190: 341 n. 32
 Aen. 6.621f.: 330
 Aen. 6.700ff.: 380
 Aen. 6.794–800: 266 n. 70
 Aen. 6.819–824: 360
 Aen. 6.860–886: 347
 Aen. 7.604–606: 266 n. 70
 Aen. 8: 192 n. 15; 357; 357
 n. 19
 Aen. 8.100ff.: 387 n. 163
 Aen. 8.185ff.: 387
 Aen. 8.202: 387
 Aen. 8.347ff.: 117 n. 90
 Aen. 8.362ff.: 390 n. 180
 Aen. 8.642–645: 346
 Aen. 8.675ff.: 117; 375
 Aen. 8.685–688: 198
 Aen. 8.696–713: 198
 Aen. 11.380: 203
 Aen. 11.732–740: 337
 Ecl. 1.4f.: 140 n. 41
 Ecl. 1.27: 204 n. 19
 Ecl. 1.59f.: 252 n. 22
 Ecl. 1.67–72: 280 n. 117
 Ecl. 2: 335
 Ecl. 2.3–5: 139
 Ecl. 2.73: 256 n. 38
 Ecl. 3.86: 320 n. 4
 Ecl. 4.55: 272 n. 91
 Ecl. 5.42–44: 162
 Ecl. 6: 100 n. 11
 Ecl. 6.1f.: 98 n. 3
 Ecl. 6.2ff.: 177
 Ecl. 6.3–12: 247 with n. 6
 Ecl. 6.3–8: 307 n. 189
 Ecl. 6.3: 324f.
 Ecl. 6.46–60: 191
 Ecl. 6.46: 74 n. 14
 Ecl. 6.64–72: 173
 Ecl. 6.64–73: 268 n. 74; 272
 n. 89
 Ecl. 7.17: 327
 Ecl. 8.82f.: 302 n. 178
 Ecl. 9.13: 98 n. 5
 Ecl. 9.35f.: 318 n. 220
 Ecl. 10: 84; 318 n. 224; 224; 424
 Ecl. 10.13–15: 139
 Ecl. 10.22f.: 84
 Ecl. 10.46–49: 297 n. 166
 Ecl. 10.44–69: 84f.
 Ecl. 10.50f.: 97 n. 3
 Ecl. 10.52–54: 140
 Ecl. 10.53f.: 106 n. 16

Ecl. 10.56–60: 286 n. 132

Georg. 1.21: 344

Georg. 1.502: 108 n. 53

Georg. 2.542: 172

Georg. 3.1ff.: 374

Georg. 3.8f.: 392 n. 193

Georg. 3.10f.: 375 n. 114

Georg. 3.17ff.: 327

Georg. 3.41: 247 n. 5; 351 n. 42

Georg. 4.125–146: 317

Georg. 4.559ff.: 363

[Verg.] *Catal.* 4.8: 269 n. 77

[Verg.] *Catal.* 9, 2.20: 269 n. 77

[Verg.] *Ciris*: 141 n. 44